The Century Bible

Job

A. S. Peake M.A

A Gift To The Students of
The Master's College
From
The Reverend Karl W. Gillmeister
June 15, 1933 - January 31, 2004

59/37

THE CENTURY BIBLE

JOB

THE CENTURY BIBLE

*GENESIS, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. BENNETT, Litt.D., D.D.
*EXODUS, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. BENNETT, Litt.D., D.D.
LEVITICUS AND NUMBERS, by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. KENNEDY, M.A., D.D.
*DEUTERONOMY AND JOSHUA, by the Rev. Prof. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A.
*JUDGES AND RUTH, by the Rev. G. W. THATCHER, M.A., B.D.
*I AND II SAMUEL, by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. KENNEDY, M.A., D.D.
*I AND II KINGS, by the Rev. Prof. SKINNER, D.D.
*I AND II CHRONICLES, by the Rev. W. HARVEY-JELLIE, M.A., B.D.
*EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND ESTHER, by the Rev. Prof. T. WITTON DAVIES, B.A., Ph.D.
*JOB, by Prof. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.
*PSALMS (Vol. I) I TO LXXII, by the Rev. Prof. DAVISON, M.A., D.D.
*PSALMS (Vol. II) LXXIII TO END, by the Rev. Prof. T. WITTON DAVIES, B.A., Ph.D.
*PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND SONG OF SOLOMON, by the Rev. Prof. G. CURRIE MARTIN, M.A., B.D.
*ISAIAH I-XXXIX, by the Rev. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., D.D.
*ISAIAH XL-LXVI, by the Rev. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., D.D.
JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS, by Prof. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.
*EZEKIEL, by the Rev. Prof. W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A.
DANIEL, by the Rev. Prof. R. H. CHARLES, D.D.
*MINOR PROPHETS: HOSEA, JOEL, AMOS, OBADIAH, JONAH, MICAH, by the Rev. R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.
*MINOR PROPHETS: NAHUM, HABAKKUK, ZEPHANIAH, HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI, by the Rev. Canon DRIVER, Litt.D., D.D.

*1. MATTHEW, by the Rev. Prof. W. F. SLATER, M.A.
*2. MARK, by the late Principal SALMOND, D.D.
*3. LUKE, by Principal W. F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D.
*4. JOHN, by the Rev. J. A. McCLYMONT, D.D.
*5. ACTS, by the Rev. Prof. J. VERNON BARTLET, M.A., D.D.
*6. ROMANS, by the Rev. Prof. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
*7. I AND II CORINTHIANS, by Prof. J. MASSIE, M.A., D.D.
*8. EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, PHILEMON, PHILIPPIANS, by the Rev. Prof. G. CURRIE MARTIN, M.A., B.D.
*9. I AND II THESSALONIANS, GALATIANS, by Principal W. F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D.
*10. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, by the Rev. R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.
*11. HEBREWS, by Prof. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.
*12. THE GENERAL EPISTLES, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. BENNETT, Litt.D., D.D.
*13. REVELATION, by the Rev. Prof. C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A., B.D.

[*Those marked* are already published.*]

The Century Bible

GENERAL EDITOR:
PRINCIPAL WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D.

223.1
J575P
1905

Job

INTRODUCTION
REVISED VERSION WITH NOTES
AND INDEX

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

EDITED BY

A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
TUTOR IN THE PRIMITIVE METHODIST COLLEGE, MANCHESTER, AND
LECTURER IN LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE; SOMETIME
FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, AND LECTURER IN
MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD

SEMINAIRE · SNOS · DES MISSIONS · LAYRAC

EDINBURGH: T. C. & E. C. JACK
AND 16 HENRIETTA STREET, LONDON, W.C.

The REVISED VERSION *is printed by permission of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.*

OXFORD
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

It may seem unnecessary to publish a new commentary on Job, when the student already possesses a work by one of our greatest Old Testament scholars. But while Dr. A. B. Davidson's commentary summed up the chief exegetical and critical results reached at the time when it was written, much of first-rate importance has appeared during the twenty years it has been before the world. The thoroughly revised last edition of Dillmann's comprehensive commentary, the commentaries by Budde, Duhm, and Marshall, the special discussions in Biblical Dictionaries and Old Testament Theologies and Introductions, the investigations into the text by Bickell, Siegfried, Beer, Klostermann, Cheyne and others, more general works such as Cheyne's *Job and Solomon*, have all appeared during this period, and it has been necessary to take account of them. New problems have emerged, and many of the old problems are now before us in a very different form. If for no other reason than to place before the student the present position, the publication of a new commentary would be abundantly justified. How far the writer has done more than report and estimate the contributions of his predecessors must be left to others to determine. He has at least tried

to see things with his own eyes and say them in his own way. To apportion his obligations to other scholars would be impossible, but he is conscious of special indebtedness to Duhm and Kuenen. The work by Fries, *Das philosophische Gespräch von Hiob bis Platon*, came into his hands too late to be used in any way.

To place the Book of Job in its proper historical setting it would be necessary to sketch the treatment of its problem in the literature of Israel. Such an outline would have been given in the present work if the writer's recent volume, *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, had not been specially devoted to this subject. The discussion of the Book of Job contained in it presents the subject in a different way from that adopted in the commentary, and may form a useful supplement to it.

MANCHESTER,
December 30, 1904.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION	1
TEXT OF THE REVISED VERSION WITH ANNOTATIONS	51
INDEX	349

THE BOOK OF JOB

INTRODUCTION

THE BOOK OF JOB

INTRODUCTION

THIS book sets before us the history of a man, whose blameless piety is confessed by Yahweh Himself, but challenged by the Satan, who in his unresting service of God has detected so much evil masked by fair appearance, that he has become utterly cynical and lost all faith in disinterested human goodness. To prove against him that Job's piety is independent of all self-regarding motives, Yahweh permits the Satan first to strip him of all his wealth and slay his children, and then afflict him with an intolerable disease. From these trials Job emerges triumphantly, and Yahweh's confidence is splendidly vindicated. Then three friends of Job, having heard of his troubles, come to condole with him; and sit seven days in silence with him. Unmanned by their presence Job at last gives vent to the passionate complaints he has so long repressed, and curses the day of his birth. This leads to a debate between himself and his friends; they reproving him for his complaints against God and attributing his suffering to his sin, while he vehemently protests his innocence and charges God with immoral government of the world, and with malignant persecution of himself in spite of his innocence. After the debate is exhausted and Job has solemnly affirmed the righteousness of his life before the blow fell upon him, Elihu, a new speaker, intervenes to set both parties right. He recognizes the failure of the friends, but in his violent polemic against Job does little more than repeat their arguments. When his speeches are at last ended Yahweh Himself answers

Job out of the storm, and in language of matchless power and beauty brings before him the marvels of creation, and convicts him of his ignorance of the mysteries of the universe. Job is humbled and subdued, and with his penitent confession of presumption in criticizing what lay so far beyond his comprehension the poem closes. The prose narrative is then resumed, and we are told that Yahweh condemned the friends for not speaking truly of Him as Job had done. Job intercedes for them, and they are forgiven. He himself is restored to health and prosperity.

It is clear that the book is not to be regarded as historical. This is shown by the account of the heavenly councils, by the symbolic numbers of Job's family and flocks, by the escape of one messenger and one only from each catastrophe, by the exact doubling of his possessions at the end of his trial. And even more obvious is it that the speeches of Job and his friends cannot be literal reports of actual speeches, since they mark the highest point attained by Hebrew poetical genius, and since no such debate could be imagined in the patriarchal age. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that the story is a pure romance, freely invented by the author. It was the method of antiquity to work with traditional material, and only so could the author count on securing the interest of his readers. Moreover, had they not been familiar with the story of a righteous man overwhelmed with misfortune, they could have retorted that the poem wanted all basis in fact, and therefore the problem it presented was unreal. But how much was taken from tradition, how much due to the author, it would be impossible to say. It is not unlikely that the story itself was borrowed by the Hebrews from abroad, since Job is represented as a dweller in the land of Uz, and no satisfactory explanation of his name can be derived from Hebrew.

God and the Universe

The poet was a strict monotheist; his doctrine of God left no room for any rival deity. He understood, indeed, the spell cast on the imagination by the sun in its splendour, or the moon as it moved, radiant and majestic, across the heavens. The old nature, which in earlier ages poured forth in adoration to the glorious rulers of day and night, was not wholly dead within him, but the faint quiver of response was rigorously suppressed. Apart from this we have no reference to idolatry or to heathen deities. We are reminded of the second Isaiah as we read the descriptions of God's greatness and wisdom, His power as displayed in nature and in history. Yet they are not in Job part of a sustained polemic against heathenism, but designed to convince man of his insignificance before God and his incompetence to pass judgement on His ways. Monotheism is so completely the poet's settled belief, that it is everywhere taken for granted and represented as the unquestioned creed of the non-Israelitish speakers.

God dwells in the height of heaven, where His throne is firmly established, shrouded in clouds and darkness, so that He is invisible to man. He is not beset with human limitations, with man's short-sighted vision, or his brief life. The clouds that shut Him in do not obstruct His piercing gaze, which not only sees all human actions, but strikes through the ocean to the gloomy depths of Sheol. He is the All-wise, none can teach Him, none hope to find Him out to perfection. Nay, when man has said his utmost, he has to confess that he has but touched the fringes of God's ways.

His power and wisdom have been manifested in many forms. First, in the crushing of His foes. The ancient lore of Babylon knew of a mighty conflict between the god Marduk and the chaos-monster Tiamat and her brood. Purged of its gross polytheism the same conception finds an echo in Hebrew literature, where we read of the

overthrow of the chaos-monster, Rahab or Leviathan, by Yahweh. Allusions to this occur in our book. By His wisdom God smote through Rahab, and her helpers cower beneath Him. When the sea burst turbulently from the bowels of chaos, and rushed upward, as if it would leap to the sky, God shut it down with doors and bars, set bounds for it that its proud waves should not overpass. Still with His strong hand He quiets its mutinous raging. Hence Job asks in bitter scorn if he is a sea or a sea-monster, that God must watch him so narrowly, lest, were His vigilance relaxed, Job should take Him off His guard, and reclaim heaven and earth for chaos. Once more, the poet knows of the rebel-giant Orion, bound to the sky as a constellation, yet with his bonds loosened in derision of his impotence. Or again, we read how God pins to the sky the swift serpent that causes the eclipse.

But God's greatness is shown especially in the creation and sustaining of the universe. He planned the mighty edifice, and measured and prepared the site. He laid its foundations and its corner-stone. It is supported from above, but hangs over empty space. Its lowest region is Sheol, the realm of unutterable gloom, the common home of all the dead. There, too, is the chaotic deep, from which the sea burst upward, and from which it is still fed by the springs in the ocean bed that lies between it and the nether deep. The dry land is girdled by the sea. On the face of its waters rests the vault of heaven, and its rim marks the boundary between light and the outer darkness. The dome is also supported by the mountains, which catch it at various points, and thus form the pillars of heaven. Above this dome lies the heavenly ocean, from which the torrential rain descends by a sluice cut through the solid roof. The less violent rains come from the clouds, the bottles of heaven, which are filled with water, and, when they are tilted, spill the water on the earth in the form of rain. It especially moves the poet's wonder that the filmy clouds do not burst with the weight

of water that they carry. It is a similar marvel that the mountain masses of the mysterious north should hang in the void. In the sky God has placed the constellations He has made. There, too, are the chambers and granaries where light and darkness and the heavenly bodies have their home, and where the elements, snow and hail, are stored. Each day of the year has its individual existence, annually, as its turn comes round, it dawns on the world. When God appears in anger He convulses the earth and overturns mountains unconsciously; His fire, the lightning, flashes along the path He has assigned to it; the pillars of heaven rock at the thunder which is His voice; the sun suffers eclipse; the stars are sealed up in their chambers and not permitted to come forth into the sky. When, however, His breath blows the clouds away, the face of the sky grows clear and bright.

The same general theory underlies the descriptions of Elihu, but some further points call for mention. The firmament is spread out strong and polished like a molten mirror. The dark thunder-cloud forms God's pavilion, but, while black without, it is luminous at the core, for it is all filled with the light in which God dwells. This light shoots in lightning-flashes from the cloud, or streams forth as the Aurora in the northern heavens. God takes the light in His hands, concealing them in it from the gaze of men, and sends the shaft of lightning home to its mark. As He utters His voice in His pavilion men hear it as thunder. The waters are drawn up from the sea into the clouds, which, though so heavily laden with moisture, float free in the sky. Then the water is poured out in the form of rain. The storm comes forth from its chamber, the cold from its granary.

The poet has not a little to say of other spiritual beings, who are called the Elohim race ('sons of God'). There is mention made of a 'first' or archetypal 'man,' older than the hills, who shared in the council of God; the

conception is similar to that of the Divine Wisdom in Prov. viii. 22–31. But he is not brought into connexion with 'the sons of God.' They are older than the creation of the earth, for, when the foundations were laid, the morning stars sang together and the sons of God raised the ringing shout. These heavenly beings are by no means free from blame. The heavens are not clean in God's sight. He puts no trust in His servants, and charges His angels with folly; He judges them that are high. We read further that God makes peace in His high places. At stated periods these spirits present themselves before Yahweh, to give an account of the way in which they have discharged their duties. One of them is named 'the Satan' (not to be identified with the devil), and his function is to oppose man's standing before God. He has therefore to test the characters of those reputed righteous, and to detect the sin which lurks under the mask of virtue. Unlike what seems to have been the case with the others of his class, he had no locally defined sphere in which to work, but freely ranged over the whole world as his province. Elihu adds one interesting development: a doctrine of intercessory angels, of whom there are a thousand. These may graciously instruct a man in the reason for his affliction, and redeem him from the destroying angels.

If the sons of God are thus impure in God's sight, how much more is this true of man! He is a creature of flesh, dwelling in a house of clay. As the woman-born, his origin is unclean; he is abominable and corrupt. Moreover his life is wretched; his days are brief and full of trouble. He is crushed as easily as the moth, short-lived as the delicate flower. Swiftly he passes from the poor pleasures life has to offer to the dense and dreary darkness of Sheol, the home appointed for all living, from which there is no return. There the bloodless shades drag out an apathetic semblance of life, in a peace whose intolerable tedium could seem welcome relief only

to the bitterest anguish. There all earth's distinctions are unknown, all its dearest ties are forgotten, even fellowship with God is no longer possible. The pale phantom is stung into a dim consciousness by the pain of his body, as it goes to corruption in the tomb, or quails before God's gaze, when, in great convulsions of nature, Sheol is stripped to His view.

It is on earth alone, then, that man and God come into relation with each other. Man's duty is to fear God and turn away from evil. And God, because He is the All-powerful and the All-wise, is also the righteous Ruler, who gives to man the due reward of his deeds. At this point, however, the problem of the book emerges, for it is just the dogma of God's righteousness which Job is forced to dispute.

The Problem of the Book

Job had met the loss of wealth and children with pious recognition of Yahweh's right to take back what He had given and with blessing of His Name. When his wife's faith had failed in his second trial, the sufferer, in his excruciating pain, rebuked her temptation to blasphemy with the noble words, 'Good shall we receive at the hand of God, and evil shall we not receive.' But the unswerving integrity was only the continuance of the old relation into conditions ultimately incompatible with it. It was an axiom of theology that the lot of the righteous was blessed, and Job was assured of his uprightness and fidelity to God. But now the axiom, so long verified in his own felicity, had proved unequal to the strain of facts. Not all at once could the deep-rooted faith of a lifetime be plucked up, and the inference be drawn that the God, who tortured the innocent, could not Himself be moral. Yet the spirit, caged in the inexplicable, must sooner or later break from the blind alley into a clearer if unkindlier air. Even before his friends came to him he felt himself slipping from the fear of God. He craved for

their sympathy to restore his fainting spirit, as the parched caravan craves for the stream in the desert. But the calamities that had made his need so desperate had dried up the springs. In the presence of his tried companions the sufferer was confident that the long-repressed complaint might find free utterance; wise and tolerant, they would not narrowly scrutinize the wild words of his despair, but soothe and reconcile him to his pain. But they failed him miserably, and, when he hungered for sympathy, offered him a flinty theology. Not, indeed, that they were callous to his suffering; they uttered their piercing lamentations, and, after demonstrations of their sorrow, sat in silent grief and compassion seven days. It is possible that their silence expressed the moral condemnation of so great a sufferer that their dogma demanded. Yet Job betrays no consciousness of this; the unrestrained complaint with which he breaks the silence proves that he confidently cast himself on their kindness. And while the friends must have inferred his sinfulness from his disasters, the debate opens with the assumption of his fundamental integrity.

The artistic movement of the discussion has been disguised by the dislocation of the speeches in the third cycle of the debate. When they have been restored to their primitive condition the scheme followed by the author seems to have been as follows. In the first round of speeches the friends ply Job with the thought of God, Eliphaz dwelling on His transcendent purity, Bildad on His inflexible righteousness, and Zophar on His inscrutable wisdom. Failing to impress Job along this line, the friends in the second cycle of speeches paint lurid pictures of the fate of the wicked; after a life spent in torments he comes to a swift and miserable death, and his posterity is rooted out. In the third cycle Eliphaz directly charges Job with flagrant sin. But, instead of permitting the other friends as before to follow in the same strain, the poet secures variety by letting the debate

double back on itself. The third speech of Bildad (xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14) repeats the theme of the first cycle, the incomparable greatness of God; the third speech of Zophar (? xxvii. 7–10, 13–23) repeats the theme of the second cycle, the miserable fate of the wicked.

The friends have little to say beyond the general principles just mentioned. The righteousness of God is not clearly disengaged from His power and wisdom. Right and wrong are just what the Almighty decrees them to be. Hence they find it hard to conceive the distinction on which Job insists, and utterly refuse to accept it, since Job's righteousness was naturally less certain to them than God's. Nor have they suffered themselves to be disturbed by the facts which seem to Job so eloquent of God's misgovernment. But they had not had Job's experience to take the scales from their eyes and make them sensitive to the world's inexplicable pain. It is not the case, however, that they interpret suffering simply as punishment. In his first speech Eliphaz depicts for Job's encouragement the blessedness of that man whom God chastens. The friends probably saw in Job's affliction both punishment and discipline, till his rebellious words forced on them the conviction that his sin was deeper than they had surmised.

It must strike the reader as strange that the antagonists develop their arguments with such little reference to the case advanced by the other side. A Western poet would have made the speakers submit the positions maintained by the opponent to a more searching criticism. But the poet is an Oriental, with far less care for pure reasoning. The friends have their settled beliefs about God and His government; nothing Job can say will move them. Hence in the first two cycles of the debate the three friends take substantially the same line, with very little reference to anything Job may have urged. Even the great passage xix. 25–27 might just as well not have been spoken, for all the influence it has on their subsequent speeches.

Similarly Job, in several of his speeches, contents himself with some words of blistering sarcasm, and then pursues his own train of thought, without reference to what his antagonists have said, though when the case has been stated by all three of the speakers he pulverizes it. He neglects them because he is wholly engaged with God.

It is this preoccupation with God which gives Job's speeches their marvellous fascination. Quite apart from all the lofty qualities that make the book a perennial delight to lovers of poetry for its own sake, there is a situation whose development is followed with breathless eagerness. Here, indeed, in the history of a soul, rather than the discussion of a problem, lies the supreme interest of the book. The detailed movement from stage to stage of the debate is exhibited in the special sections devoted to this purpose in the commentary. At present a more general sketch may suffice.

Job's problem is, in the first instance, personal. Why has God sent such undeserved calamities on His faithful servant? In his first rebellious utterance he had barely referred to God. But the reply of Eliphaz, with all its considerateness, stung him to the quick, since it took for granted his guilt and rebuked the temper he displayed. Its chief result was to drive him into open revolt against God and scornful protest against His lack of magnanimity. Yet he ends with a pathetic reminder to God that, when regrets are too late, He will long once more for fellowship with the victim He had so harshly crushed. When Bildad replies with an assertion that God cannot pervert judgement, Job bitterly assents. The Almighty sets the standard of righteousness; how can a frail mortal make good his case against omnipotence? For it is God's settled determination to make him guilty, and He who selects His victims with no moral discrimination will readily effect His purpose. If God would only release him from his pain and not paralyse him with His terror, then he would plead his cause undismayed. Re-

sentful but wistful, he appeals to God not wantonly to destroy His creature, on whom He had lavished such pains and skill. Then with sudden revulsion, as a new light bursts in, he sees in God's care a darker design than he had guessed. All along God had planned the stroke, but He had smiled on Job to betray him, meaning to mock his confidence and make his misery extreme. And now He performs exploits of valour against His defenceless victim. Ah! why did He suffer him to be born? let him have a brief respite from torture, ere he goes for ever to Sheol's utter gloom. The reply to Zophar definitely assails the dogma of the friends. God is wise and mighty—no need to teach him such platitudes. But these qualities are displayed in destructive rather than in beneficent operations. With the friends he does not care to argue, sycophants, who would fain curry favour with God by smearing their lies over His misgovernment. As if God would tolerate such apologists, as if He dreaded to be found out! Job will fearlessly speak his whole mind, reckless though he imperils his life. Why does God refuse to answer him, and persecute him so relentlessly? Why does He bring into judgement man, so short-lived, so frail, so impure? Let him pass his brief day in such comfort as may be possible, for man dies and never wakes from the sleep of death. If only there might be a waking! if in Sheol, where there is no remembrance of God, he might wait till God's anger had ceased to burn, and then hear His voice calling him back in love, how gladly he would resume the blessed communion with Him. Vain dream of bliss! from Sheol no man can return.

Job has told all that was in his heart. He charges God outright with immorality, yet he feels that fellowship with Him is the highest good. Hence he holds together incompatible conceptions of God. The God whom he knew in the past and whom he might know again in the future, if he could still be alive to know Him, is quite

other than the God of whom he has such bitter experience in the present. The hope that God might recall him from Sheol he firmly sets aside. It never establishes itself in his mind. But the feeling that his present experience of God does not reflect God's inmost character is a feeling which develops at last into the great belief, 'I know that my vindicator liveth.'

In the second cycle of the debate the friends simply describe the fate of the wicked. We need not assume that their main object was to hold up a mirror for Job, the allusions to his case are far less pointed than is sometimes asserted. If their descriptions fitted him, well and good; if not, they served the main purpose of establishing against Job the retributive justice of God. But while their side makes little advance, Job moves forward to a more peaceful state of mind. The very vehemence with which he paints God's hostility sends him by sharp recoil to seek his vindicator in Him. From the scorn of his friends he is driven to God, beseeching Him with tears to maintain his right. But with whom? With whom can it be but with Himself? Let the God of the future be surety for him with the God of the present. In his next speech this thought attains its climax. Two things are added. The prayer becomes an assurance, God will vindicate him. And though he has passed from this life, he will as a disembodied spirit be permitted to see God and know that his integrity is established. This lofty certainty is not without effect on Job's subsequent utterances. Yet it plays a much smaller part than we should have anticipated. This is partly due to the fact that at this point the personal gives way to the universal problem. For, as in the first, so also in the second round of the discussion, Job does not assail the friends' position till all three have stated it. Accordingly his third speech in this cycle is devoted to an attack on their dogma that the wicked suffer for their sin. Job flatly denies it, on the contrary they live a happy life

in prosperity and die without lingering illness. To the suggestion that they suffer in the suffering of their children, Job answers that a penalty of which they are not conscious is no penalty at all.

In the third discussion Job ignores the direct assault of Eliphaz on his character, though in the course of his first speech he affirms his integrity. The greater part of this speech is occupied with another description of God's misgovernment. But he also comes back to his own relations to God, and strikes a less confident note than in xix. 25–27. It was perhaps natural that faith should not maintain itself at such a height. But we may also trace in the relapse the influence of the indictment he has urged against the moral order of the world. Though he would fain come face to face with God, and argue his cause with Him, his inscrutable, irresponsible Judge eludes him and baffles his most earnest search. The reply to Bildad's third speech (xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14) seems to have been for the most part lost. Probably it contained, between xxvii. 11 and xxvii. 12, a criticism of God's government, so bold that it was struck out as dangerous to piety. In what remains Job once more firmly asserts his integrity. To Zophar's third speech, reaffirming the doom of the wicked, Job's final speech (xxix–xxxi) constitutes the formal reply. Really it lies outside the debate. Job first describes his former happiness in the favour of God, the possession of his children, the honour of men; then sets against this the scorn and insult heaped upon him, the pain from which he is suffering, and God's cruel enmity; lastly, he solemnly declares himself innocent of any such sins as might justify his calamities, and proudly declares himself ready to confront God.

So the human debate reaches a worthy close. The friends have exhausted their case and failed to vanquish Job. Their platitudes about God's greatness he feels to be irrelevant, or rather to make His immorality worse.

Their assertion of His righteousness he denies, the plainest facts seem to him to refute it. Their personal accusations are shivered against his conscious integrity. In the course of his pleadings with God he has been distracted between God's persecution of him in the present and His kindness in the past. He has swung from one extreme to the other; now holding God's former goodness to have been carefully calculated to make his present suffering more intense, now feeling the old communion with Him to be the pledge that His love would reassert itself. And yet the fire of His wrath burns so fiercely that at best it will not die down till the victim has passed into the gloom of Sheol. Then when this inexplicable aberration has given place to God's normal mood, He will remember the servant whose love had been precious to Him. Once more He would call him back to renew the happy intercourse. But it will be too late. Yet not too late for some reparation. God will Himself establish his innocence, and he for one blissful moment will see God as his vindicator. And there is no stranger thought in the book than that God may be surety to Himself for Job. It is as though God suffers the knowledge of His future attitude to mitigate the full sweep of His anger. He is to take sides against Himself, to secure Himself against vain regrets.

The God of the past and the future was the real God, Job's God of the present was a spectre of his morbid imagination. And when God appears, we expect that this will be plain. But He wears the spectre's mask. He speaks out of the storm, laying aside none of His terror, while Job still writhes in the grip of his unresting pains. He mocks his ignorance and limitations, plying him with questions that he cannot answer, and displaying in the marvels of the universe the wisdom and might of its Creator. Now Job had all along admitted the wisdom and power of God; he had confessed that he could not meet God on equal terms, or solve one in a thousand of

the problems with which omniscience could baffle his human understanding. Moreover, he had implored God to release him from pain when He appeared for the contest, and not to affright him with His terror; he had even expressed his confidence that God would not contend with him in the greatness of His power. Not only, then, does God seem to be forcing an open door, but to act less worthily than Job had expected of Him. The reader is also surprised that God does not explain to Job why he suffers, and especially why light is not thrown on the general problem of suffering.

These phenomena, which have led some to regard the speech of Yahweh as a later addition, have their sufficient reason. The speech is designed in the first place to widen Job's view. Maddened by his pain he had freely asserted that God's government of the world was immoral, a sweeping generalization, drawn in the first instance from his own experience, though he easily found numerous facts to support it. God convicts him of narrow outlook, and suggests in doing so the unimagined complexity of the problem. He alone, who has comprehended the vast universe that God must govern, has the full right to say whether He governs it well or ill. But Job, while he has spoken of God's power as displayed in the world, is quite unable to explain its phenomena. One by one God makes him ponder them, if each is an inscrutable mystery, what must be the mystery of that universe, whose government Job has so confidently condemned? If God is wise and strong as Job has confessed, ought there not to be much in His action that man cannot properly appraise? Further, Job is reminded that man does not constitute the whole of God's animate creation. All the incomparable pictures of the untamed creatures of the desert are meant to bring home to him the range of God's interests and the tender care He lavishes on such beings as are beyond man's everyday horizon. Thus man comes to a humbler view of his own importance, and learns

that he must transcend his self-centred attitude, if he is to judge the ways of God aright.

A second lesson, which Job learns, is, that it is not for him to lay down the terms on which God must meet him. He had challenged God to justify the treatment meted out to him, and God ignores his demand. He is assured that God will not contend with him in the greatness of His power, and God answers him out of the storm and makes him feel how tremendous are the resources of His energy. He concludes his proud self-vindication with the words, 'as a prince I would go near unto Him,' and so he quails before the vision of God and repents in dust and ashes. That this was less worthy of God the poet would not have admitted. It might indeed seem as if the majesty of God and the taunting irony of His words were calculated to bludgeon Job into submission, rather than change his opinions by convincing his reason. But Job needed a sharp lesson of this kind to chasten his presumption; he must learn the true relation of man to God. Yet this is not the chief cause why the poet chose to introduce God as he did. It was because only thus could the desired result be fully attained. For it is not what God says that is all important. It is the overwhelming impression made on Job by the vision of God that leaves him at the end of the poem contrite and subdued. All that God says he had theoretically known before, though in all its detail it had not lived to his imagination. But now he attains an experience new in quality. 'I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, But now mine eye seeth thee; Wherefore I abhor myself and repent In dust and ashes.' And we see with what subtle art the poet has introduced those very features in the poem which critics have urged to prove that the speech of Yahweh is a later addition. For it is just the fact that Job is already well aware of what God tells him which enables us to measure the impression that the vision of God makes upon him. And it is only in

accordance with his practice of anticipating later developments, when he makes Job deny that God would appear as He actually appears in the sequel.

But why does he permit God to speak and yet offer no solution of the problem? Probably he had no solution, or he would surely have so constructed his poem as not simply to indicate it, but to throw it into relief. Ought he then to have kept silence, lest he should be charged with attempting a task too hard for him, or reminding men of a misery he had no skill to charm away? There would be much force in such a criticism were peace to be won only in this way. But the author knows another path. And because he knows it the speech of Yahweh does not explain the origin of Job's suffering. Here his instinct was sounder than that of those who urge this silence in proof that the speech is later. It was not necessary for the reader to learn why Job suffered; he had known it all along from the Prologue. But it was necessary that Job should not be enlightened. Quite apart from the fact that the question in the Prologue is not one between Yahweh and Job but between Yahweh and the Satan, the poet, by revealing to Job what had passed in heaven, would have ruined the artistic effect and flung away the deepest teaching he had to give. It is imperative that Job should be left in ignorance at the end, since the lesson he learns is just this that he must trust God, even if he does not understand the reason for His action. And it is precisely this which constitutes the imperishable value of the book and its universal significance. For the explanation of Job's suffering would have been but the explanation of a single case, of no avail for others since the Satan would not court such discomfiture again. But Job, ignorant yet trustful, is a model and a help to all who are confronted by the insoluble mystery of their own or the world's pain. Even had the author so completely solved the problem that no problem remained, this would have been less precious

than what he has actually given us. He had found another way. Job does not know now, any more than before, why he suffers. But his ignorance no longer tortures him, he does not wish to know. For he has escaped into a region where such problems exist no longer. He has attained peace and knows that all is well, though he does not know, or care to know, how it is possible. And it is most instructive to observe how the poet represents this inward rest to have been won. The caustic irony of the Divine questions, and the impressive array of the wonders of nature and Providence, above all the vision of God Himself, crush and humble the presumptuous critic of God's ways. Yet the very sense of his own ignorance and frailty, and of God's wisdom and might, is a return to the religious temper of mind. He has become a man of broken and contrite heart, penitent and self-loathing, who, because he knows himself to have nothing and deserve nothing, can most readily cast himself upon God, whose wisdom and omnipotence no longer crush but uphold and uplift him. Such is the way of peace the poet offers, a certainty of God, which rises above all the dark misgivings of His goodness, and is itself inspired by God's revelation of Himself.

Here, so far as Job was concerned, the book might have closed. He could go forward in pain and penury, still mocked by the base, still suspected by the good. He needed no outward confirmation of the assurance he had won in the vision of God. But is God to leave His loyal servant, who has won His wager with the Satan for Him, who has blessed Him in bereavement, and uttered the language of resignation in his pain, who has held fast his integrity, and refused to curry favour with Him by flattery, is He to leave him in misery, now that the cause for misery has passed away? What kind of a God would He be to do it? The writer could not represent Job as rewarded in another life, for though he turned with longing to the thought of immortality, he could not accept

it with any confidence. Hence it was necessary for God to restore him in this life, if He restored him at all. Thus the author leaves, not only his hero, but his reader reconciled to God.

The Integrity of the Book

Scholars are almost unanimous in the view that the book has received additions since it came from the hands of the original author. We may take the speeches of Elihu first, since there is the most general consensus of opinion about them. The great majority of scholars consider them to be an addition by a later author. The chief critics who regard them as part of the original poem are Budde, Cornill, Wildeboer and Briggs, while Kamphausen and Merx think that they are by the author of the book, but were subsequently inserted in it, the work not having contained them originally. As a rule those who attribute the speeches of Elihu to the same author as the other speeches regard them as a serious contribution to the debate, and in fact as containing the author's own solution of his problem. But the view has also been taken, e. g. by Briggs and Genung, that the author introduces Elihu as the self-confident young man, who intervenes in the debate to set both parties right, but really contributes little that is of value. This view may be safely set aside. It rests on a correct estimate of the worth of Elihu's utterances, and the extravagant self-eulogy in which he indulges leaves an almost comic impression on the reader's mind. But the inflated style in which he announces his perfect wisdom would strike an Oriental differently, and the contents of the speeches show plainly that they are seriously meant by the author, and not simply that Elihu takes himself seriously. The author gives no hint to the contrary, and the whole drift of the speeches is inconsistent with the view that Elihu is the butt of his ridicule. For while he says little that is new, he speaks in a very earnest tone, and says much

that is worthy and true. It would, in fact, reflect great discredit on the author if he put such sentiments as we find in Elihu's speeches in the mouth of a man whom he introduced for the express purpose of making him ridiculous. And this is all the more evident when we observe that Elihu anticipates to some extent the line taken by Yahweh. The author certainly cannot have intended to pour contempt on the latter; had he wished to treat Elihu in this way he would have carefully refrained from putting into his mouth the ideas which are present in the speeches of Yahweh. It is interesting to notice that, according to the Testament of Job, Elihu was imbued with the spirit of Satan, and was afterwards declared by God to be a serpent, not a man, and was not pardoned with the friends, but cast into Sheol. In the Jerusalem Talmud he is identified with Balaam.

Assuming then that Elihu is to be taken seriously, the objections to the view that his speeches belong to the original poem must be considered. In the first place he is not mentioned in the Prologue or the Epilogue. It is perhaps of little importance that he is omitted in the Prologue, since he has a Prologue to himself (xxxii. 1–5), though even in it no explanation is given of his presence at the debate. But it is most significant that he is not mentioned in the Epilogue, where judgement is given on the other speakers. He is not contemptuously passed over, for we have seen that the writer considers his contribution to be real and important. Nor is it satisfactory to say that the silence implies tacit approval. For then we should have expected that even more than Job he would have been singled out by Yahweh as having spoken of Him the thing that was right. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that the author of the book would have passed a different judgement on Elihu from that passed upon the friends, so that if his speeches belonged to the original work we should have expected him to be involved with them in a common condemnation. With this, how-

ever, we have already assumed the truth of the second reason for judging the speeches to be later. This is that Elihu occupies substantially the same standpoint as the friends, and says little more than they have said already, and said better. He, as well as they, asserts that the sufferings of Job are due to his sins. It is true that he lays more stress on the value of suffering for man's discipline and on God's goodness in dealing with men. But these are not new thoughts, for in the very first speech of Eliphaz the blessedness of the man whom God chastens is described. But in any case it is true that substantially the attitude of Elihu is that of the friends. It can hardly be regarded as likely that after the case has been stated at such length by the friends, and has been conclusively refuted by Job, the author, and especially a poet of such genius, should have delayed the movement of the poem by interposing a series of speeches which are a mere repetition of what has been said before. The awkwardness is too glaring. The debate is exhausted, the friends have unfolded their arguments, Job has not only replied, but also solemnly and at length affirmed the innocence of his past life. Now it is appropriate for Yahweh to intervene. But before He does so Elihu attempts to galvanize the debate into life. Yet though he makes four speeches Job makes no reply, though it would have been easy to show the insufficiency of his arguments. The same conclusion that these speeches are later follows from the style. The literary genius displayed in them is much inferior to that shown in the rest of the book. They are diffuse and tedious, less spontaneous, and often very obscure. Budde himself confesses that the speeches as a whole make an unfavourable impression upon him, when he looks away from details, but he thinks that this may be removed if certain portions are regarded as glosses. In reply to this it may be said that if it is to be really removed we should have to cut so deep that little would be left to defend. The language also is

unlike that of the rest of the book. It is strongly marked by Aramaisms, and uses words which rarely or never occur elsewhere in the poem. It would imply much too artificial a view of the poet's method to suppose that he consciously placed Aramaisms on the lips of Elihu, as appropriate to his Aramaic origin, and it is doubtful if such was his origin. It is true, however, that Budde's careful investigations have greatly modified the argument from language. Again, it is very hard to believe that the original poet should have weakened and partly spoiled the effect of the speeches of Yahweh by inserting before them Elihu's description of the heavens and their phenomena. Nor, if Elihu's speeches are an integral part of the poem, is it easy to understand the opening words of Yahweh. They are not a scornful dismissal of Elihu, for Yahweh is answering Job, and the author of the Elihu speeches, as we have already seen, did not regard them as words without knowledge. Moreover, the reference to Job and not to Elihu seems to be fixed by xlii. 3. But since they seem to refer to the last speaker, it follows that Job was the last speaker, and that the Elihu speeches formed no part of the original work. There are some differences between these speeches and those of the friends which point to difference of authorship. While the latter quote Job from memory, Elihu quotes from the earlier speakers more precisely, as if their speeches lay before him in a book. He also often mentions Job by name, though this may be partly accounted for by the fact that he is blaming both parties and may wish to distinguish. But neither the friends nor Yahweh ever mention Job by name. Elihu is also introduced at much greater length than the friends. Finally, the very fact that the speeches can go out entirely and not be missed speaks strongly for their later origin.

Budde considers that the speeches of Elihu contain the author's solution of the problem, but he states the

idea of the book in a peculiar way. He argues that while Job was outwardly blameless, and regarded himself as blameless, sin slumbered in his heart, unknown to himself. God sent his sufferings to bring it to expression, and after it had been thus detected to bring him to penitence. This sin was spiritual pride, which, under the pressure of his pain, came to full manifestation in his speeches. The function of Elihu in the poem is to show Job this defect in his character and explain his sufferings in the light of it. A similar view is taken by others, among whom Cornill may especially be mentioned.

This view labours under great improbabilities. It is a serious objection to it that the contrast between spiritual pride and acts of wickedness is not plainly expressed. Elihu does not seem to confine himself to the former, and alludes to pride only in xxxiii. 17 and xxxvi. 9. This is very strange if this solution was the piece of perfect wisdom with which the author wished to solve the problem. Further, the whole poem has been strangely constructed if such is the main lesson the author intended to teach. The long speeches of Job and the friends have on this interpretation little significance. Nor does the theory cast a very favourable light on the Divine speeches. It may be fitting that after Job has proudly summoned God to debate with him he should be reduced to silence by a mere man, who meets him with merely human weapons, and cannot overwhelm him with the terror of Divine majesty. But when he has thus been abashed and vanquished by his youthful antagonist, it is hardly fitting that God should ply him with ironical questions to bring home to him the limitations of which Elihu has already convicted him. Moreover, Job himself speaks as if he had been shown his fault not by Elihu at all, but by the vision of Yahweh. A further difficulty arises out of the statements in the Prologue. There Job is presented as a blameless and upright man, fearing God and turning away from evil. Yahweh himself endorses this view of

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE LIB
SANTA CLARITA, CA 913

his character, and affirms that there is none like him in all the earth. In His words no irony can reasonably be detected. We therefore get no hint that all along Yahweh's attention is concentrated on the latent sin of Job. If it was really His purpose to bring it into explicit consciousness the reader is set on a false track at the outset, for he understands that it is a really righteous man who is suffering, and that he suffers to vindicate Yahweh's faith in the disinterested goodness of His servant, against the Satan's cynical disbelief. Budde argues that it is Yahweh who takes the initiative in calling attention to Job, and that He was therefore already meditating the ordeal through which the patriarch had to pass. But while it is true that Yahweh takes the initiative, it is far more reasonable to think that He does so to cure the Satan of his cynicism than to probe the hidden depths of Job's heart.

Cornill urges that a poet who stated the problem so sharply and drove it to its extreme conclusions must have had a solution, or he would stand confessed as having attempted a problem beyond his powers, a tormentor of mankind, driving his sting with delight deeper and deeper into the deadly wound. Where then, he asks, is the solution to be found? Not in the speeches of Job and his friends, for in the very last speech of Job, xxix–xxxi, the dilemma is set forth with unexampled sharpness. Nor is it in the speeches of Yahweh, which give Job no friendly comforting word, but only a rough repulse, clothed in the form of irony. Nor does the Prologue provide it, for Job knows nothing of the test to which he has been submitted to prove his fidelity. And it is absolutely necessary that he should get an answer to his question. But the speeches of Elihu do provide an answer. In isolated cases of apparent unrighteousness one must not overlook the love and providential wisdom of God, which are to be seen in the normal order of the world. Further, if God does not hear men, this is not at all because He cannot or will not,

but because men do not call on Him in the right way. But Elihu's chief contribution is that suffering is an educative instrument in God's hands; it leads man to self-knowledge, temptation reveals to him the sin slumbering within him, which as yet perhaps has only failed of an opportunity. If a man mistakes this educative function of suffering he commits a grave sin and is rightly punished by God, but if he recognizes it and takes it to heart, suffering becomes for him a source of endless blessing, the highest activity of the Divine love to him. Cornill regards this as the highest solution open to one who stood at the Old Testament standpoint, for having no knowledge of a future life, he had to find an answer without passing beyond this life.

We have already seen, however, that it is very hard to believe that the poet regarded it as the chief aim of Job's suffering to elicit the sin that unknown to himself slumbered in his breast. Nor can Cornill's postulate be granted that the author must have felt himself to be in possession of an intellectual solution of the problem, before he would have ventured to compose his poem. It is more probable, as we have seen already, that he had no such solution, but found peace in another way.

We may, then, conclude with confidence that the speeches of Elihu are a later addition. Nor is it hard to understand why their author added them to the original work. He was dissatisfied with the discussion as it stood. He felt that the three friends might have made more of their case. That he did not improve upon their statement is no disproof of his dissatisfaction with it, since it is one thing for a man to see the failure of his predecessors, another for him to provide anything superior, or to realize that what he has provided is not superior. But while dissatisfied with the friends, he was even more shocked by Job's language about God, which was certainly bold to the verge of blasphemy. He accordingly added the Elihu speeches, partly to protest against Job's tone, partly to

draw out at fuller length the lines of thought hinted at in the other speeches, the goodness of God and the discipline of suffering. And in his estimate of Job, and the reason he alleges for his suffering, he comes in conflict also with the statements of the Prologue. That he does not take up an explicit attitude to the account of Job's suffering given in the Prologue cannot be urged as a reason for supposing that the speeches are the work of the original author, who consistently represents his characters as ignorant of the Heavenly Councils. Artistic propriety equally required that a later poet should represent his characters as similarly ignorant. It is true that he might have placed in Elihu's mouth a denial that suffering was ever to be explained as it is in the Prologue. But, while this may very well have been his view, it would have been a very bold thing to contradict the Prologue outright. The reader would not have known what to think. Since, however, he does give an explanation of Job's suffering different from that in the Prologue, we must conclude that he really disagreed with the latter and wished tacitly to condemn it.

The speeches of Yahweh have been regarded by nearly all scholars as part of the original work. This view has been rejected, however, by a few critics, especially Studer, Cheyne, and Hoonacker. The grounds of their opinion are first that the speeches adopt a line of argument which Job has discounted already, and secondly that we have no declaration of Job's innocence nor explanation of his suffering. These objections have been already substantially discussed in the preceding section. Theoretically Job had discounted the Divine speeches; in other words, he had largely granted beforehand the truth of what God now says to him. Yet the general confession was compatible with a dull sense of God's working in the details of Nature, and Job had shown no appreciation of His tender loving care for His sentient creatures. In both respects the speeches correct his limitations. But the great experience, which overwhelmed and assured him,

was the realization of God Himself. It has further been explained already why the author does not represent God as giving any explanation of Job's sufferings or any solution of the general problem.

It has been urged by Hoonacker that the author of the Elihu speeches cannot have been acquainted with the Divine speeches or the Epilogue. Otherwise he would not have added his own contribution. He gives the following reasons: (*a*) The author would have felt no difficulty as to the silence of the friends if God Himself intervened. (*b*) He regards Job as not merely lacking in wisdom but as impious (xxxiv. 7, 8, 34 ff., xxxv. 16); when writing xxxiv. 34 ff. he had not before him the story of Job's repentance and pardon. (*c*) Elihu does not admit that God can grant Job's wish to debate directly with Him; he considers it useless to expect that God should deign to answer him; accordingly Job's hope was absurd, and his complaint of God's refusal an attack on His majesty (xxxiii. 12 ff.). (*d*) Elihu believes that Job can still be refuted, and in xxxii. 13 f. deprecates the conduct of the friends in leaving Job to God, not to man. The facts, however, are capable of a much simpler explanation. Not only did the author of the Elihu speeches dissent from the Prologue, he wished also to attack the original poet for the impropriety of which he had been guilty in permitting God to participate in the debate. Not only did it compromise His dignity in the eyes of this author, but the introduction of a *Deus ex machina* seemed unnecessary. He felt himself quite equal to solving the problem, and reverence forbade that God should be brought in to solve a situation that man could solve by his own power. While the recognition of this polemical purpose amply accounts for the facts, there are positive considerations in its favour. If the poem as read by this author did not contain the speech of Yahweh, how did he hit on the thought that the friends were leaving Job to be vanquished by God? There was no suggestion of this in their speeches; it is an

inference from the two facts, their silence and the reply of God. Moreover, how strange that another supplementer, quite ignorant of the author of the Elihu speeches, should also have hit on the idea of Yahweh's intervention in the debate, in this case to execute, and not to deprecate, it. It is not unlikely that the author disapproved of the Epilogue. Still, the difficulty here is much slighter than that of harmonizing it with the speech of Yahweh.

While, however, we may with confidence regard the words out of the storm as an integral part of the original poem, we should with the great majority of scholars, look on the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan as a late insertion. The reasons for this conclusion are given in the introduction to that section (pp. 329–331), where it is also pointed out that we should probably combine the two Divine speeches into one, as also the two penitent confessions of Job.

Objections have been urged against the Prologue and Epilogue. The former, however, is indispensable; apart from it the subsequent debate would be unintelligible. The objection that the explanation of Job's suffering expounded in it is not put forward in the poem, not even in the speech of Yahweh, has been met already. The speech was not intended to explain why Job suffered, and could not have explained it without losing much of its value. Dr. Marshall thinks the Prologue is later than the poem, since the poem asserts the sole causality of God, and therefore leaves no room for the activity of the Satan. But, quite apart from the question how far we may identify the views of the speakers with those of the author, there seems to be no such advance in speculation as would prevent our ascribing the Prologue to the same age as the poem. The Satan is strictly subordinate to Yahweh, and acts only by His permission. It is just because it is his special function to strip off the cloak of fair pretence that he disbelieves in disinterested goodness. He has no personal ends to serve, rather, as a loyal servant, he would

guard his Master against the abuse of His goodness. Naturally, holding his opinion so obstinately, he will gladly ruin Job to prove himself right. It is not so much that he hates his victim as that he hugs his own cynicism; though there was a malicious zest in so piquant an experiment, to say nothing of the gambler's instinct. Really the relation he sustains to God is substantially the same as that held by the lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets, and this does not occur in a late passage. Nor can the present writer grant that the theodicy of the Prologue is the sublimest in the book, inasmuch as Job does not in his view suffer for the glory of God, but to vindicate God's faith in the genuineness of his piety.

Several have objected to the Epilogue on the ground that the happy ending cannot have been added by the original writer. It moves too much, they think, in the region of the old ideas, against which the poem is a passionate protest. Job receives a vulgar compensation, and the old doctrine of prosperity for the righteous is reaffirmed. But this is perhaps too modern in its sentiment, and it overstates the case. For the Epilogue traces no inevitable connexion, as the old theory did, between character and circumstances; how could the author have done so, with the story of Job's sufferings before him? It was his concern, not to deny that sin and adversity, righteousness and prosperity, often went together, but to affirm that they did not invariably accompany each other. After all, the Gospel itself takes up essentially the same position as the Epilogue. It has, further, been pointed out that the function of the Epilogue is to leave the reader content with God's conduct; it is added for His sake rather than for Job's. Some have felt that the Satan ought to have been brought forward to confess the disinterested character of Job's piety. But such a formal confession the author may well have felt to be unnecessary. The Testament of Job represents Job's sufferings as going on for many years, while his wife bravely wins a livelihood for him, but only

at the last yields to the instigation of Satan and bids Job curse God. Job rebukes her and then challenges Satan to contend with him, not with a frail woman. Then Satan broke forth into tears, and said, 'I yield to thee who art the great wrestler.' The desirability of a confession of defeat on the Satan's part was felt early.

It is quite possible that the author borrowed both Prologue and Epilogue from an earlier book, which may have been known to Ezekiel (xiv. 14), though his reference to Job could be explained by knowledge of an oral tradition. Some of the arguments adduced in favour of this view are weak. But it is certainly very difficult to believe that the poet should himself have written xiii. 7, 8. God had introduced His speech with a description of Job's utterances as 'words without knowledge,' and this strikes the key-note of His whole speech. Job responds in language of contrition, loathing his words. How strange then that God should immediately after say that Job had spoken of Him 'the thing that is right,' a judgement hard to reconcile with the tone and explicit statement of God's speech or with Job's confession. Again the friends had been misguided, but they were sincere and God-fearing men, why then should God be so angry at their 'folly' that He can be appeased only by sacrifice and Job's intercession? Usually it is said that Job's bold facing of the facts of life was more congenial to God than the friends' attempts to conceal them. This, however, does not escape the difficulty. We cannot avoid the conclusion that for God to represent Job's speeches as right, and those of the friends as impious, does not harmonize with His attitude to Job in the Divine speech or with the line taken by the friends in the debate. It is more probable that this judgement originally referred to a wholly different set of speeches. The 'folly' of the friends reminds us of that of Job's wife, an impiety consisting of a temptation to curse God. Job's right speech about God is more likely to have been of the character of his utterances in the

Prologue. Probably, then, in an earlier Book of Job another type of debate stood between the present Prologue and Epilogue; the friends talking 'folly' or impiety, inciting the sufferer to abandon his integrity, while Job spoke that which was 'right,' the language of pious resignation. The poet had to cut out this dialogue and substitute his own. But he left the Epilogue as he found it, since, though he would not have chosen such terms to express the character of the speeches, they could be harmonized with his general intention to applaud Job and condemn the friends, as, indeed, they usually have been harmonized.

Several other problems are raised with reference to various parts of the book. They are discussed in the course of the exposition; it will be convenient to register the results here.

xxv–xxvii. Bildad's third speech probably consisted of xxv. 2, 3; xxvi. 5–14. We should eliminate xxv. 4–6 as a gloss, based on xv. 14–16. Job's reply consisted of xxvi. 2–4, xxvii. 2–6, 11, 12. The greater part of his speech, containing probably a very bold criticism of the Divine government, stood originally, it would seem, between xxvii. 11 and xxvii. 12. Zophar's third speech is largely preserved in xxvii. 13–23; possibly 7–10 belongs to him, though 8–10 may be a gloss.

xxviii. is a later addition, and not to be assigned either to Job or Zophar.

xxiv. 1–24 may possibly be a later addition, or perhaps substituted for a less acceptable speech, but it may quite well be genuine in the main, though verses 18–21 are in any case impossible on Job's lips, and are probably an insertion.

xxx. 2–8 probably stood originally in connexion with xxiv. 5 ff.

Other dislocations are xxviii. 7, 8, which should probably follow xxviii. 12; xxix. 21–25, which should follow xxix. 10; xxxi. 38–40, which should come at an earlier point in the

chapter, though it is quite uncertain where; xxxiii. 4, which should follow xxxiii. 6; xli. 9–12, which should follow xl. 24. Perhaps vi. 27 should follow vi. 23. xxxi. 1 is out of place in its present context, but an emendation is suggested in the note on that verse to remove the difficulty.

The Text

The text of the book has been till recently regarded as very well preserved. But for some years past a very different estimate has been formed by several scholars, and the received text has been made the subject of much emendation. It is not easy to treat the question with profit in a work intended largely for the English reader. But some reference must be made to it, especially since the difficulties of interpretation raise so often the problem of the text.

Since Hebrew was written without vowels, and many of the consonants were much alike, it was quite easy, and in fact has not been uncommon, for one letter or group of letters to be mistaken for another, and this was helped by the comparative ease with which letters could be rubbed and partially or entirely obliterated. Mistakes might also arise through the carelessness of the copyist, or through defective hearing if he wrote from dictation. Deliberate alterations might be made to avoid anthropomorphisms or expressions in other ways objectionable, or to smooth roughnesses and make the style trim and tame, in harmony with the scribe's canons of literary elegance. The criteria for detecting and healing corruption are partly supplied by the divergence of the versions (especially the Septuagint) from the Hebrew, partly by considerations of inherent probability. Our Hebrew MSS. present practically the same text, and have probably been ultimately derived from one copy, in whose favour all rival texts were suppressed.

The use of the Septuagint (LXX) is complicated by the fact that the true text of the LXX is nearly four hundred

lines shorter than the Hebrew. The missing lines were supplied by Origen from the translation of Theodotion, and although the asterisks with which he marked these additions were largely retained in five MSS., it was not till the publication in 1889 of a Coptic translation of the LXX that the actual extent of its text was determined. Bickell, who had previously explained the omissions in the LXX as due to the obscurities of the Hebrew, or the theological objections taken to some of Job's utterances, or the sheer looseness of the translator's rendering, now argued that the four hundred lines in question were added to the original poem (see also Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 215–45; this was subjected to a searching criticism by Dillmann in an article entitled *Textkritisches zum Buche Hiob*, published in the *Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie*, Berlin, 1890, pp. 1345–73). But Bickell went a great deal further. Many lines were struck out by him which are found both in Hebrew and LXX. Partly his treatment was occasioned by material, partly by formal objections to the present text. It might be that he detected inconsistencies, or needless repetitions, or excessive diffuseness, and on the ground of these material objections eliminated the portions that offended his reason or his taste. Cases of this kind have to be settled each on its merits. But his formal principles postulated a regularity in structure which could tolerate no deviation, and the text had perforce to be fitted into his scheme. The original poem consisted, in his judgement, exclusively of four-lined stanzas. The present poem is, as a matter of fact, written mainly in couplets, two of which may very frequently be combined to form a quatrain. But sometimes the number of couplets is odd, not even; in that case, when the section is distributed into quatrains, a recalcitrant couplet is left, and has to be expunged, or by extensive alterations six lines have to be manipulated into four. But we have several instances where the couplet is replaced by a triplet. In this case similar measures have to be employed. Nor is this all,

for not only have there to be so many lines to a stanza, but each line must be built on a given pattern; it must in fact be written in a certain metre. Now with all the freedom of scansion which Bickell exercises, very many lines will not as they stand conform to his rules; and they must be made to conform, or if that prove impracticable, be deleted. The outcome is that the poem has to lose not merely the four hundred lines absent from the original LXX, but an enormous number besides, and that very extensive alterations are made in those that are left.

The theory has met with little favour, though it has been adopted wholesale by Dr. Dillon in his *Sceptics of the Old Testament* (1895). This work contains a translation of Bickell's text, and exposition of the ideas of the poem as thus restored. It called forth a very valuable article by Dr. Driver in *The Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1896, which may be earnestly commended to those who wish to see convincing reasons for not adopting the theory. This is not the place for any detailed discussion, but a few general remarks may be offered. The LXX text does little to remove the stumbling-blocks of the Hebrew, and it creates worse difficulties of its own. It retains the passages which give rise to the most serious questionings, while its omissions dislocate the movement of the poem. The theory that quatrains alone are legitimate rests on evidence altogether too slender, and the couplets of which they are composed are often unequally yoked together. Triplets may fall under suspicion, but only if material as well as formal objections can be urged against them. As to metre, the whole subject at present lies in too much obscurity to warrant textual changes on this basis alone. A line may be suspicious because it is abnormally long or abnormally short, but beyond this, in Job, at any rate, it is not safe to go.

It no doubt often happens that the Versions help us to correct the Hebrew, sometimes by presupposing, at other times by giving the clue to a better original. In other

cases the critic must resort to conjecture, in which the parallelism or the demands of the general sense may guide him to a satisfactory correction. Naturally the process is attended with much danger of error; but few, who have any knowledge of the results it has achieved in skilful hands, will be inclined to make light of it. The numerous studies devoted of late to the emendation of Job have certainly not been without substantial result, as will be clear from the commentary.

The Date

It is needless to waste many words on the old-fashioned view that the poem dates from the time of Moses or earlier. The antique colouring is proof, not of the book's antiquity, but of the author's art, in conforming his presentation to the age in which the hero lived and suffered. The absence of explicit reference to Hebrew law or history ought never to have been quoted to prove the author's ignorance of them, since he would have been a poor artist indeed to let his characters exhibit familiarity with the institutions of a people that belonged to a period later than the time in which they were placed. It would be more plausible to think of the reign of Solomon, a period of intellectual activity and intercourse with foreign nations. But the phenomena of the book hardly permit us to place it earlier than the time of Jeremiah. The decisive argument in favour of this view is the stage of religious reflection represented by it. It was not till the age of Jeremiah, when the state was breaking up under the assault of Babylon, that the old belief in the association of prosperity and righteousness began to give way before the facts which disproved it. The destruction of Jerusalem and the Exile made the question a burning one. It is hard to believe that it can be as early as the time of Jehoiachin or Zedekiah, in which Dillmann places it. Nor indeed can it well be as early as the beginning of the Babylonian

Exile, the latest date which Dillmann is prepared to leave open as a possibility. The problem is no longer in its elementary stage. It has been long pondered and discussed, and this agrees best with a date considerably later than that of Jeremiah. Several scholars have placed it towards the close of the Exile, making the author contemporary with the author of Isa. xl–lv. A comparison of the two writers discloses correspondences which cannot be accidental. There are especially close points of contact between the figure of Job and that of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh. The Servant is to be identified with the historical Israel, which had died in the Exile and was to be restored to life by a return from captivity and re-establishment in its old home. The meaning of its suffering and death is closely connected with its mission to the world. That mission was to bring to the Gentiles the knowledge of the true God. When the Servant has been restored from exile, the Gentile nations perceive the error they had made in connecting its calamities with its sin. Israel, that had been faithful to the true God, had suffered; the idolatrous Gentiles had escaped. The sufferings of Israel are accordingly interpreted as vicarious; by its stripes the nations are healed. The suffering of the innocent, the misconception of the suffering as penal, the restoration, are all paralleled in the case of Job. But the profound explanation that the suffering is vicarious is not to be found in Job. This has led many scholars to the belief that Job must be earlier than the Servant poems. Could he have neglected the interpretation of the problem offered by them? He had sought long for an answer to the question which wrung his heart; could he have been blind or indifferent to a solution so illuminating? The argument is telling, but by no means conclusive. The author may have found no help in the thought of vicarious suffering. But, apart from this, he may well have hesitated to transfer this explanation of the calamities which had befallen a nation, elect to a world-wide mission, in furtherance of that

mission, to the calamities of an individual. Job has no such sphere of universal significance to fill. Israel may suffer for the nations, but what would Job's vicarious suffering avail? We need not therefore regard this as an insuperable objection to the view that Job is dependent on the Second Isaiah, if there are reasons for adopting this conclusion. And there are such reasons. While both powerfully assert the power and wisdom of God as shown in the Creation, this forms part of a sustained polemic against heathenism in Isa. xl–lv, whereas in Job it is a securely-won doctrine, taken for granted by non-Israelitish speakers, while idolatry is left almost entirely out of account. In other words, the conflict with paganism, which fills so large a place in the literature of Israel down to the Return, and is not completely extinct even later, is here left out of account. And the relation of Job to the Servant of Yahweh really leads to the same result. For Job is not, as some have argued, to be identified with the Servant; he is not the nation, but an individual. There can be little question whether the problem of suffering was raised first in connexion with the nation or with the individual. The recognition of the individual was quite late in comparison with that of the nation, the suffering of the one created a problem sooner than that of the other. Attention was at first too much absorbed by the colossal disasters of the nation for the individual case to receive attention. The dependence lies with Job rather than with the Second Isaiah, since the figure of the suffering Servant was directly created by the contemporary circumstances, and the author needed to take no suggestion for it from elsewhere. The author of Job carries the question a stage further from the nation to the individual.

The post-exilic date is confirmed by other considerations. The angelology is late, its affinities lie largely with the doctrine of angels in the literature subsequent to the Return. The Satan occurs in no early literature, but only in Zechariah and Chronicles. The inwardness of its

ethics points to a time later than Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant. The diction is late rather than early, Aramaic, and to a certain extent Arabic, words being found in it, and there are many words which occur elsewhere only in the latest parts of the O. T. It is unfortunate that in several instances, where Job and other pieces of literature exhibit marks of dependence, no judgement can be expressed with any confidence as to the side on which dependence lies, equally competent critics holding opposite views. Moreover, some of these related sections of the O. T. are themselves of very uncertain date. xii. 7–10 suggests that the author may have had Gen. i. 20–25 in mind. A clear case of dependence is that of vii. 17, 18 on Ps. viii. 4. Job bitterly parodies the Psalmist's question. The eighth Psalm is often thought to presuppose Gen. i, which belongs to the Priestly Document promulgated in 444 B. C. We could in that case hardly place Job earlier than about 400 B. C. The close affinities with Malachi suggest a similar conclusion, which is perhaps the most probable view. We need feel no hesitation in adopting a date subsequent to Ezra's reformation, on the ground that on the uncongenial soil of legalism such a poem could not have arisen. The Book of Jonah and some of the Psalms, to say nothing of Ecclesiastes at a later time, show plainly how little we can speak of any uniformity in post-exilic Judaism. There is no need to come much below 400 B. C. Oscar Holtzmann has argued in Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 348–52, that the book can be accounted for only by postulating the influence of Greek thought; and that the dialogue form is due to imitation of the dialogues of Plato, who also pondered on the cause of human suffering, and before whose mind there rose the greatness and beauty of the world. Accordingly he places the book in the Ptolemaic period. His arguments, however, have rightly met with scant approval. Siegfried (*Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. vii. p. 197) appears to think that it belongs to the time of the Maccabees, and considers that

xv. 20 ff. seems to allude to the fate of Alexander Jannaeus. We cannot say that such a date is impossible. But there is no cogent reason for adopting it. Moreover, the additions made to the book imply a fairly long history.

The Art of the Book

There has been much fruitless controversy as to the literary label that should be attached to the book. We cannot force this splendid fruit of Hebrew wisdom into a Greek scheme, and it is really futile to discuss whether it is a drama or an epic. It is itself. We may more profitably linger on some of its literary qualities. Like Hebrew poetry in general its most striking formal characteristic is its parallelism. Usually the second line repeats the thought of the first, though sometimes it states the contrast to it, or perhaps it completes the thought begun but left unfinished in the first. The parallel structure brings to the ear the same kind of satisfaction as rhyme, but unless very skilfully used it is apt to pall in a long poem. In this book its monotony is largely overcome by the poet's blending of various types of parallelism and by the occasional use of triplets instead of couplets.

The poet is a master of metaphors, taken from many spheres of life. The work of the farm suggests a figure to describe those who sow iniquity and reap trouble, or the comparison of death in a ripe old age to the coming into the barn of the shock of corn in its season. The fate of the wicked is likened to that of the stubble driven by the wind from the threshing-floor or the chaff chased by the storm. Job compares himself in his prosperity to a tree drinking up the water by its roots while its branches were refreshed by the dew. His words were awaited by the assembly as thirstily as the parched clods look up for the rain. In the long life he then anticipated he compared himself to the phoenix. He longs for death as the slave

panting under the heat longs for the cool evening which will bring him his rest; or again, death is sought with the eagerness that characterizes those who dig for hid treasures. The wicked is compared to the Nile grass suddenly cut off from the moisture and withering rapidly; his trust can as little support him as a flimsy spider's web. Man's brief life is like the flower opening in beauty and suddenly cut down, the swiftness with which it passes is illustrated by the weaver's shuttle, the courier, the speed of the light skiffs on the river, or of the eagle as it swoops on its prey. The completeness of his disappearance from earth when he passes into Sheol is compared with the vanishing of the cloud. The failure of streams supplies him with several metaphors; thus Job illustrates the disappointment he had experienced from the friends by the caravan that comes to the channel down which the turbid torrent swept in winter, only to find the brawling stream scorched out of existence in the summer heat, and perish in the search for new supplies. The failing waters furnish an apt metaphor for the irretrievable ebbing away of life, while the forgetfulness of past trouble is illustrated by the oblivion into which they run. Military figures are common. More than once Job describes God as an archer with Job for His target. He tortures him with suspense, letting His arrows whistle about him, before He sends them home. Or He is a wrestler of gigantic strength with Job for His antagonist and victim. A third illustration is that of a fortress with a breach made in the walls through which the enemy pours. The fate of the wicked is set forth under the figure of an attack on a den of lions, the old lions have their teeth dashed out and perish for lack of prey, while the whelps are scattered abroad. There are many other metaphors for the evil destiny that awaits the godless. His branch is not green, or it is dried up by the flame, or again his root is withered beneath, and his branch cut off above; he is like the vine that fails to bring to maturity its unripe

grape, or the olive shedding its flowers. His path is all beset with snares, the hell-hounds of terror chase him, but which ever way he turns they meet him, closing on him from every side. While he flees from the iron weapon the brass bow pierces him with its arrow. He is driven away as utterly as a dream of the night. While wickedness is a dainty tit-bit in the sinner's mouth, held fast that all its delicious sweetness may be enjoyed, and only reluctantly let go, yet it will turn to the gall of asps within him. Natural phenomena are described by graphic images. Clouds formed the garment and swaddling band for the infant sea, new born from the bowels of the chaotic deep. The clouds as they float in the sky are like bottles filled with water, which when they are tilted spill the rain. The dawn is a woman peeping over the crest of the hills, and the rays of light are her eyelashes. Darkness is a coverlet in which the wicked are shrouded from sight, suddenly the light comes and twitches the covering away so that the wicked are shaken out of it and stand revealed in the glare of day. And under the light the world lies all clear cut like clay freshly stamped by the seal, or like a body clothed with its close-fitting robe. The caracole of the horse is compared to the leaping of a locust.

The book is studded with the most exquisite descriptions. The whole of Yahweh's speech is a sustained effort of the highest genius, unsurpassed in the world's literature. The animal pictures are like instantaneous photographs, catching a characteristic attitude, and fixing it for us in the most vivid words. And with what power and beauty are the marvels of the universe set forth! The laying of its foundation amid the songs of the morning stars and the joyous shouts of the sons of God; the birth of the sea, and the staying of its tumultuous heavenward leap; the punctual dayspring, flooding the world with light; the springs that feed the sea from the nether deep; the gates of Sheol; the dwelling of light

and darkness; the stores of hail and snow made ready for God's battles; the sluice cut through the firmament by which the torrential rain descends; the frost that turns the streams to stone; the rain that falls on the waste afar from man; the mighty constellations, obedient to God's behest; the lightning with its purposeful movement; all pass before the mind as God unrolls the panorama of the universe. And fully worthy to be mentioned with this is the wonderful description in Bildad's third speech, closing with the awed confession that we stand but at the outskirts of God's ways, where the deafening thunder of His power is mercifully heard from afar. Less noteworthy than these is the fine description of God's power and wisdom in ix. 5–10. Or take the vision of Eliphaz, where the old terror masters him as he narrates it. How vividly it all passes before us; the preparation in the musings on his night trances; the fear that sets his bones quaking, the cold breath across the face, the hair on end, the vague thing that his straining eyes could resolve into no shape he could name, the dead silence and then the thin voice. Or, for its quiet soothing beauty, the peroration to the same speech. And what a sense of peace steals over the weary as he reads the longing words in which Job describes the untroubled calm of Sheol, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. How full of dismay and yearning is the plaintive assertion of the hopelessness of man's fate (xix. 7–21)! How graphic Bildad's picture of the terrors that surround the sinner and the evil destiny to which he is doomed!

The poet's power of irony is displayed most conspicuously in the speech of Yahweh. But examples may be culled from the debate. Thus Job bitterly asks God what is frail man that He must so narrowly observe him, or whether he is himself a sea or sea-monster that God should set a watch over him. The friends' arguments he satirizes with pungent scorn, their proverbs are proverbs of ashes, their wisdom consists only of platitudes; he tells

Bildad that he really must have been inspired to make one of his speeches. One of his most biting and delightful phrases is aimed at them, 'How irritating are words of uprightness.' Bitter indeed is the question whether he had taxed their friendship by asking them to do anything for him, as if he had thought friendship could stand such a test!

His pathos is deeply moving. Job feels acutely the unkindness of his friends, he even turns to them with the appeal, 'Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends!' But it is little that he says to the friends in this strain. It is rather to God that his pathetic pleadings are addressed. 'My friends scorn me, But mine eye poureth out tears unto God.' With such care had God fashioned him, with such kindness preserved him, why does He wantonly destroy him? Soon he must die under God's stroke, but by and by God's present mood will pass, then He will seek for His servant in love, but alas! too late. Especially the swift movement to death elicits some of Job's most touching words, and the thought of the dreary interminable darkness that awaits him.

The character-drawing of the book is not highly developed. The friends are distinguished to some extent, but they have no very clearly-marked individuality, and they take very much the same line. The character-study of Job is more subtle, as the interest of the poem centres about the struggle of his soul caught in the web of mystery and pain. On this, however, it is not necessary to repeat what is said elsewhere.

The Author

It is not needful to add many words. We know nothing of the author save what we learn from his book. He was a Jew, and lived probably in the south of Judaea on the edge of the wilderness. The restraints of civilization were irksome to him; he loved freedom, and sympathized deeply with the wild life of the desert, far from

cities and their bondage. He had travelled in the desert, probably in a caravan, had marked the streams swollen in the snow's thaw, and how they vanished in the summer heat. Possibly he had himself been in danger of the fate he describes in vi. 18. He had seen and pitied the wretched outcasts, without home or clothing, huddled under the rocks for shelter from the drenching rains, famished because food was so scarce, and driven to theft to keep themselves and their children alive. He had journeyed to the sea, which seemed in its turmoil to seek escape from its bonds, and had seen how its waves tossing never so high always fell back, and how it could not pass its appointed bounds. Herein he had recognized the restraining might of God. To the desert-lover the uncongenial sea appeared an impious thing. Probably he had travelled as far as Egypt, though he may have known it only by report. He had often watched the constellations, and the marvels of nature had roused his curiosity and awe.

But he had pondered far more deeply the ethical and religious problem presented by the moral order of the world. With a flaming hatred of wrong and tender pity for the oppressed, he saw the triumph of the wicked and the misery of the just. He was familiar with the current doctrines, and knew how they ignored the most patent facts. A truly religious man, he had found his heart drawn to God by the irrepressible instinct for fellowship with Him, driven from Him by the apparent immorality of His government. He had known what it was to be baffled in his search for God and to feel himself slipping from the fear of the Almighty. An intellectual solution he had not been able to reach. But in humble submission to God's inscrutable wisdom, and in a profounder sense of fellowship with Him, he had escaped into the region of unclouded trust. It is a wonderful victory of Jewish piety that our author, who saw the anguish of the world as clearly, felt it as acutely, exposed it as relentlessly as the author of Ecclesiastes, yet unlike him rested at last in God.

Selected Literature

The commentaries and special discussions are so numerous that no useful purpose could be served by naming a tithe of them. Of the older literature it may suffice to mention Schultens and Rosenmüller, both written in Latin. The chief modern German commentaries and expositions are those of *Ewald, *Delitzsch, Kamphausen, *Zöckler (in Lange), Merx, Hitzig, Hoffmann, Dillmann, Budde, Duhm, Fried. Delitzsch, Ley. [Those marked with an asterisk have been translated into English.] Of English expositions no more need be named than those of A. B. Davidson (Vol. i, 1862, all published), and of the same author in the *Cambridge Bible*, Cox, Elzas (Jewish), Watson (*Expositor's Bible*), Bernard (Christian Jew), G. H. B. Wright, Bradley, Gibson (*Westminster Commentaries*), Marshall (*American Baptist Commentary*), Addis (*Temple Bible*). Several of the commentaries contain translations. Other translations are: (*a*) into German, Reuss, Baethgen (in Kautzsch), Bickell (from his reconstructed text, accessible to the English reader in Dillon's *Sceptics of the Old Testament*), Duhm; (*b*) into French, Renan and Reuss; (*c*) into English, Gilbert, *The Poetry of Job*, Genung, *The Epic of the Inner Life*, and Rotherham in *The Emphasized Bible*.

Special discussions are to be found in the Introductions to the O. T., the Bible Dictionaries, Histories of Israel, and Old Testament Theologies. The following may be added: Godet, *Old Testament Studies*; Budde, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob*; Giesebrecht, *Der Wendepunkt des Buches Hiob*, Froude in *Short Studies*; A. M. Fairbairn in *The City of God*; C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays*; Green, *The Argument of the Book of Job Unfolded*; Cheyne, *Job and Solomon* (and numerous articles in the *Expositor*, *Expository Times*, and *Critical Review*); Duhm in *The New World* for 1894; Bruce in *The Moral Order of the World*; Davison, *The Wisdom*

Literature of the Old Testament; Peake, *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament.*

For textual criticism the books and articles mentioned in the section on the text, and in addition Siegfried's edition of the Hebrew text in the *Polychrome Bible* (the English translation with commentary has not been published, the author's general conclusions may be found in the articles 'Wisdom' in Hastings' *Dictionary* and 'Job' in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*); Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, and *Textkritische Studien zum Buche Hiob* in Stade's *Zeitschrift*; Klostermann, article 'Hiob' in Herzog, *Realencyklopädie* (third edition). Recent commentaries deal pretty fully with this side of the subject; Duhm especially is rich in emendations.

Since a mere list of names is of little use to the student without further guidance, a few remarks are offered on the selection of books. If he is restricted to English works, he might take the chapter in Driver's *Introduction*, or the article by Margoliouth in Smith's *Dictionary* (second edition), or by Davison in Hastings, for his starting-point. For detailed exegesis he would have, in addition to the present work, the two commentaries by Davidson. Of these the former is, so far as it goes, by far the more valuable, and Davidson's failure to complete it is a permanent impoverishment of our English exegesis. Its critical point of view was rightly abandoned later, but in every other respect it is to be preferred. In no later work did the author seem as though he could 'recapture That first fine careless rapture.' Still, the disappointment that the later commentary provokes is simply created by comparison with the author himself, and by the fact that in the twenty years which have elapsed since it was written many new problems have emerged. He could next take Cheyne's *Job and Solomon*, and then his article in *The Encyclopaedia Biblica*. He should be on his guard against the excessive literary analysis in both, especially the latter, and against the radical textual

criticism, which, however, is very little affected by his Jerahmeelite theory that has since attained such a remarkable development. He could then turn to some of the special studies mentioned, and the recent fresh and suggestive commentary by Marshall.

If, however, he can read German, he should study Kuenen's valuable discussion in his Introduction, and take Dillmann's commentary as the basis for his detailed work. To this he should add Budde and Duhm, the latter of which is among the most suggestive and original commentaries on the book ever published. All three of these will be much more useful to the reader who knows something of Hebrew than to those who are ignorant of it.

Explanation of Symbols

A. The main portion of the book, including Prologue and Epilogue, not improbably incorporated from an older book.

B. The speeches of Elihu.

W. The poem on Wisdom (ch. xxviii).

L. The Behemoth and Leviathan sections.

M. Later additions.

Dislocations and wrong allocations of speeches cannot be indicated by these symbols; they are pointed out in the chapter on 'The Integrity of the Book.'

It is unnecessary, and in this case not very satisfactory, to give a brief table of contents. The exposition of each section is preceded throughout by a full analysis.

THE BOOK OF JOB

REVISED VERSION WITH ANNOTATIONS

THE BOOK OF JOB

[A] THERE was a man in the land of Uz, whose 1

i. 1–5. The character, wealth, and family of Job. The unbroken merry-making of his children, and his scrupulous precautions to atone for possible impiety occasioned by it.

1. The author plunges at once into his story, without preliminary moralizing or anticipation of his subject. He introduces his hero, with a bare mention of his name and home, and then describes to us his character and possessions, fittingly giving the place of honour to the former. For he wishes to set his problem before us in the sharpest form; there must be no room for the misgiving that the sufferer's afflictions are the due reward of his deeds. And thus to emphasize how inexplicable, on the current theory of retribution, were his calamities and disease, he depicts him as one 'blameless and upright, God-fearing and turning away from evil.' Alike to himself and to others this was attested by his worldly prosperity. A numerous family and wonderful wealth proclaimed to all how high he stood in the favour of Heaven. For the author does not wish simply to move us by the spectacle of sudden and immense disaster, moving though such a spectacle must always be, and trebly pitiful when disaster is undeserved. He accentuates as much as possible the prosperity of Job, that he may make his tragic change of fortune utterly bewildering to himself and all too plain to the world. For long happiness had beguiled him into a sweet certainty of God's favour, and, in the light of his conscious innocence, a blow so crushing could be at best a dark mystery, but to gloomier moods a devilish mockery. It was all the more hideous that it struck him deeply in his honour. In the world's judgement a clever hypocrite had been at length unmasked, whose sin could be measured by the overwhelming greatness of his punishment. As in a Greek tragedy, the suspense is deepened for the reader by his knowledge from the first of the facts hidden from the sufferer and his friends. Since he is undistracted by any doubt of Job's piety, and knows that it is the Satan who has achieved his ruin, his attention is concentrated on the real dramatic interest, the struggle of a soul, conscious only of its own rectitude, to adjust its exquisite but unmerited pain to the theistic beliefs it has previously entertained. While the author emphasizes not only the excellence of Job's character but the

name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright,
2 and one that feared God, and eschewed evil. And

greatness of his wealth, we see that his goodness was more eminent even than his substance, for while he was 'the greatest of all the children of the East,' there was none to compare with him for character and piety in all the earth.

the land of Uz. The situation is uncertain. According to Gen. x. 23 Uz was connected with the Aramaeans, and according to Gen. xxii. 21 with Nahor. This suggests that it should be sought in Naharina (the so-called Aram Naharaim), on the east of the Euphrates. This is favoured by the inclusion of Job among 'the children of the East,' and perhaps by the fact that the raid on his cattle was made by the Chaldeans. It would agree further with this that Bildad the Shuhite (cf. Gen. xxv. 2, 6) may have belonged to the Sûḥu, who, as we learn from the inscriptions, lived on the right bank of the Euphrates, south of Carchemish. Elihu is a Buzite (xxxii. 2), and Buz, like his brother Uz, is represented in Gen. xxii. 21 as a son of Nahor. He is further described as of the family of Ram. This, however, favours the connexion of Uz with Edom, for Ram, according to 1 Chron. ii, was the son or brother of Jerahmeel (cf. Ruth iv. 19), and the Jerahmeelites, like the Calebites, lived on the south of Judah. Still, it is possible to regard Elihu as an Aramaean, if Ram is either an abbreviation or a mistake for Aram. Although the account of Elihu is a later addition, it is important as very early evidence of the position to which Uz was assigned. Fried. Delitzsch thinks that Uz occurs, as the name of a district, in the cuneiform inscriptions, but Winckler reads differently. If Delitzsch is correct the exact position is still disputed. He fixes the situation near Palmyra; Dr. Francis Brown, however, says it must be near the Orontes. But many scholars seek for the land of Uz not to the north of Palestine at all, but to the south-east, in the neighbourhood of Edom. In Gen. xxxvi. 28 Uz is named as a grandson of Seir the Horite, in other words, Seir is closely connected with Edom. This is the case also with Lam. iv. 21: 'Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz.' Among those who are named in Jer. xxv. 17-26 as drinking of the cup of fury, we find 'all the kings of the land of Uz' (ver. 20); Edom, however, is mentioned separately (ver. 21). Eliphaz was a Temanite, i. e. he came from Edom; and he bears an Edomite name (Gen. xxxvi. 4). We can hardly, in any case, identify Edom and Uz, but they must have been neighbouring countries. It is difficult to decide which land of Uz is to be regarded as Job's home. Possibly the traditional connexion of 'wisdom' with Edom should incline the balance in its favour.

whose name was Job (Heb. *Iyyōb*). The name has been

there were born unto him seven sons and three daughters. His substance also was seven thousand 3
sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she-asses, and a very great household; so that this man was the greatest of all the children of the east. And his sons went and 4
held a feast in the house of each one upon his day; and they sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to

---

very variously explained. Among the meanings assigned to it are: 'the hated one,' 'the depressed,' 'the penitent,' 'the pious.' The author can hardly have invented it, since there is no hint in the book that he saw in it any fitness to Job's character or career. It no doubt belonged to the traditional story, and the Hebrews may have explained it to mean 'the persecuted one.' But if the name of the hero was derived with the story from abroad, it would probably be vain to attempt the discovery of its original meaning.

perfect. The author does not mean that he was sinless. It would be better to translate 'blameless'; he could not be charged with wickedness towards God or man. In this and the following words the author would show us that Job fulfilled the ideal alike of religion and morality. Yahweh Himself endorses this estimate of Job's character (ver. 8, ii. 3), Job insists on it vehemently, as the one thing that remains firm, amid the collapse of his earlier convictions, and the friends at times confess it.

2. Foremost among the blessings of heaven stood a numerous posterity. The numbers, seven and three, are chosen to show his perfect good fortune in this respect, while the preponderance of sons over daughters reflects the Eastern estimate of women. In the enumeration of Job's possessions the writer operates with multiples of seven and three, and of ten, their sum.

3. substance (marg. 'cattle'). The latter is the usual sense of the word, and generally its use is restricted to sheep and horned animals; sometimes, as here, it is used in a wider sense. The she-asses were more valuable than the males on account of the foals. To look after so large an establishment a very numerous body of servants was necessary.

4. The author gives here an example of Job's anxious piety, and at the same time prepares the way for the catastrophe narrated in verses 18, 19. The meaning seems to be that Job's children lived a life of constant festivity. Every day the sons met in each other's houses beginning with the eldest, and going to the others in rotation. Apparently they were not married, since no mention is made of their wives, but each had his own house. The three

5 drink with them. And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified

---

sisters, who probably lived with their father and mother, joined their brothers each day at the feast. The feast at each brother's house seems to have lasted only a single day, and there was a regular cycle of feasts, lasting seven successive days. When one cycle of feasts was ended Job offered sacrifices, and a new series began. Some think this cannot be the meaning, but that feasts were held more rarely, each feast lasting several days, and ending with sacrifice. 'His day' would in that case probably mean his birthday (cf. Hos. vii. 5). But the language of verses 4, 5 does not favour the view that the feasts occurred at irregular intervals. We are not reading prosaic history. The life depicted is like that of princes in fairy tales, a never-ending round of mirth, disclosing at once the great prosperity of Job and the happiness of his family. 'His day' means the day that falls to each in the order of seniority, the eldest son entertaining on the first day and the youngest on the seventh.

5. There is no touch of moroseness in Job's piety, nor any wish to check their innocent joy. So week by week he lets the full round of festivity be completed, without any interference. But while his piety is not gloomy, it seeks to avoid the mere possibility of evil. Open blasphemy of God he does not suspect among his children. But he knows the danger that when wine has weakened the normal self-restraint, irreverence or a still darker impiety may rise and be cherished in the heart. So lest any of his children should have sinned in this way, Job sends for them at the end of each cycle of feasting and sanctifies them. Having thus prepared them for the holy rites, he offers burnt offerings for each, and thus atones for their possible transgressions. The author insists on this for a twofold reason. He wishes to deepen the impression of Job's piety. Others might wait till they knew sin had been committed, Job is so scrupulous that he guards against the possibility that it may have been committed. Moreover, while little regard was paid in antiquity to any transgression save in act or word, the inwardness of Job's religion is displayed in that he feels the guilt of a sin in thought. The second reason is that he wishes to show that the catastrophe which destroys Job's children cannot be accounted for by their sin (as Bildad hints, viii. 4), since it occurs on the very day when the atoning sacrifice has been offered for them (verse 13).

We should perhaps translate, 'when they had let the days of the feast go round.' The point of time indicated is when one cycle of festivity had ended and the next had not yet begun.

sent and sanctified them: the meaning is probably that

them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and renounced God in their hearts. Thus did Job continually.

Job sent for them and sanctified them when they came, hardly that he sent a priest and sanctified them, as Fried. Delitzsch supposes. The sanctification is not something effected by the sacrifice, but the ceremonial preparation for it, cf. 1 Sam xvi. 5. In what this ritual purification consists we are not told, but probably in ablutions and either the washing of their garments or the putting on of robes specially reserved for religious rites. The thought underlying this is that on the one side the stain of the world must be removed before the worshipper enters the presence of God, on the other side that the contagious holiness of altar or sanctuary renders garments worn by the worshipper in his approach to God unfit for use in the ordinary duties of life. This inconvenient holiness might be washed out of the robes, but it was simplest to keep a special set of clothes for holy occasions (see Gen. xxxv. 2; Exod. xix. 10–25; Ezek. xliv. 19; Isa. lxv. 5, 'Come not near to me lest I make thee holy'; 2 Kings x. 22).

offered burnt offerings. The sacrifice is not the technical sin-offering of the Priestly Code, but it atones for sin. The distinguishing feature of the burnt offering is that it was completely devoted to God, no part of the victim being eaten by the worshipper, as was usual in early sacrifices, which were communion feasts strengthening or re-knitting the bond between the Deity and the worshippers. In the burnt offering the idea of physical communion has fallen into the background, and the thought is rather of the efficacy of a victim wholly surrendered to God. In the later days of national disaster the burnt offering assumed a wholly new prominence, and prepared the way for the later development of a specific sin-offering. It is to be noticed that Job acts as priest for his own household; probably he offered a burnt offering for each of his ten children. The sacrifice takes place on the morning when the feast is in the eldest brother's house.

renounced (marg. 'blasphemed'). The word in the Hebrew text means properly 'to bless.' Probably this is the sense intended here, in which case we must regard it as a euphemism for 'curse,' a similar usage existing in colloquial English. What seems to be meant is not a deliberate cursing of God, for which antiquity would have expected the death penalty, but such irreverent feeling about God as wine might engender. While Duhm thinks the author is himself responsible for the euphemism,

6 Now there was a day when the sons of God came to

---

some other scholars believe that the author wrote 'cursed,' but that a scribe altered it out of reverence. The scribes have let it stand, however, in Isa. viii. 21. Possibly, as Budde suggests, a milder word than 'cursed' stood here originally, as would, indeed, be more suitable. Gesenius in his *Thesaurus* took the view that since the word meant originally 'to kneel,' it might come to mean indifferently 'to curse' or 'to bless,' as a man kneels to invoke either a curse or a blessing; but we should in that case have expected the word to be frequently used in both senses. Another view, which is accepted in R. V. text, and endorsed by the high authority of Dillmann, Davidson, and Kuenen, is that since partings were accompanied with blessing, the word got the sense 'to say good-bye to,' 'renounce.' But blessings were also invoked when people met as well as when they parted (1 Sam. xiii. 10; 2 Kings iv. 29, x. 15). And 'renounced' surely implies something too deliberate. The same word recurs in verse 11 and in ii. 5, 9.

i. 6–12. In a heavenly council the Satan reports himself to Yahweh with the other 'sons of God.' Challenged by Yahweh to detect any flaw in Job's piety, the Satan urges that it is purely self-regarding, and that if Yahweh would reduce him to utter poverty he would curse Him to His face. The Satan is permitted to put Job to this test, but forbidden to smite his person.

6. The scene in heaven is meant to prepare the reader for the catastrophe and give him the clue to it. The closest parallel is 1 Kings xxii. 19–23. Apparently at stated seasons **the sons of God** come to the heavenly assembly to give Yahweh a report of the way in which their duties have been performed. Each probably has his fixed province, since it was thought that each kingdom had its own angel-prince (Dan. x. 13, 20, 21, xii. 1; Isa. xxiv. 21, 22). They are regarded as responsible for the order of their provinces, hence they are condemned for the misgovernment that prevails in the world, as in the apocalyptic passage in Isaiah just quoted, and in Pss. lviii, lxxxii. The term 'sons of God' suggests a wrong idea to the English reader. The meaning is not that they are sons of God, or servants of God; but 'sons of the Elohim' means those who possess the Elohim nature, those who belong to the order of Elohim, supernatural, spiritual beings, just as 'sons of men' means those who belong to the human order, and 'sons of the prophets' means members of the prophetic order. Morally, they are not regarded as more perfect than men, rather they may be described as morally neutral, our distinction between good and evil angels being unknown. Thus

present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them. And the LORD said unto Satan, 7
Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from

---

the sons of the Elohim contract unions with the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 1–4) from which spring the Nephilim. So the spirit, who in Micaiah's striking vision becomes a lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets to entice the king to his death, is a member of the heavenly host. Since with the exception of the Satan these sons of the Elohim have no further significance for his story, the author does not linger on what passes between them and Yahweh, but goes on at once to the conversation between Yahweh and the Satan.

Satan. As the margin says, the word means 'The Adversary.' The word is in not uncommon use in Hebrew. It has the article here, and is not a proper name, hence it would be far better to translate 'the Satan.' Although not yet a proper name, it is a title borne by a particular spirit, expressive of the function he exercises. He observes the doings of men that he may detect them in sin, and then oppose their claims to righteousness before God (cf. Zech. iii). Since it is his duty to see the bad side of human action and character (the good side perhaps falling to be observed by another spirit), he has in the exercise of it grown cynical. He has seen so much evil covered by fair appearance, that he has lost all faith in human goodness. In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 the term has become a proper name. As he appears in Job he cannot, of course, be identified with the devil, who only later found a place in Hebrew thought. He is one of the sons of the Elohim, entrusted with a special Divine commission and existing only to do Yahweh's will. Yet his cynical disbelief in disinterested goodness, and the heartlessness and malicious zest with which he suggests the trial of Job and carries it out, make it easy to account for the later development by which he came to be recognized as an evil spirit, hostile to God, and as one who tempted man not to vindicate his disbelief in human goodness, but to seduce men from God to their ruin and His sorrow.

7. While some at least of the other Elohim are entrusted with a kingdom for their province, the Satan is entrusted with a function, and is therefore not subject to their local limitations. Since, then, there is no fixed region of the earth, to which his energies are confined, Yahweh asks him whence he comes. In his reply he does not name any special part of the world where he has been working, for in his unresting service of Yahweh he has been visiting all parts of it.

8 walking up and down in it. And the LORD said unto
Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job? for there
is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright
9 man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil. Then
Satan answered the LORD, and said, Doth Job fear God
10 for nought? Hast not thou made an hedge about him,
and about his house, and about all that he hath, on
every side? thou hast blessed the work of his hands,
11 and his substance is increased in the land. But put

---

8. Yahweh takes the initiative, but not because he is already planning Job's trial, with the view of bringing to light the spiritual pride, which, unknown to Job himself, lurked in his heart. He Himself endorses the judgement which the author has passed on Job, certainly with no touch of irony, but meaning what He says. Moreover, in ii. 3 He charges the Satan with inciting Him against Job. It is therefore clear that His reason for calling his attention to Job is that He may cure him of his cynicism by pointing to so conspicuous a refutation of it.

for: we should perhaps adopt the marginal translation 'that,' since **for** suggests that the contemplation of an upright character would be pleasing to the Satan.

in the earth: echoes the Satan's words in the previous verse. He had ransacked the world, had he ever found Job's peer?

9. The Satan has long ago 'considered' Job, and tacitly concedes that Yahweh's description is just. But if he cannot deny his piety, he can at least impugn its motive. The spoiled darling of Heaven may well seek to please his Master and keep his place. Small wonder that he is so devoted to God, when God has made devotion so worth his while! It is rather interesting that some Old Testament writers think abundant wealth a snare. Thus the writer of Prov. xxx. 5–9, reproving the agnostic utterance in verses 1^a–4, prays that he may have neither poverty nor riches, the former leading to theft and blasphemy, the latter to the denial of God (cf. Deut. xxxii. 15). It is a Christian commonplace, at least in theory.

10. The description is such as to bring out in the strongest way how great are Job's possessions and how absolutely secure he is from attack. 'Thou' is emphatic, hast not Thou, the all-powerful, so protected him that no evil can strike him? There is not the least chink in the hedge, that Yahweh has set about him, through which disaster can steal upon him.

forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will renounce thee to thy face. And the LORD said unto 12
Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the LORD.

And it fell on a day when his sons and his daughters 13
were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's

---

11. But let Yahweh tear down the hedge, and leave His servant bare to the blast, let Him strip him of all that he has. Then Job will be His fawning sycophant no longer, but will curse Him to His face.

The literal translation of the last clause is, 'if he will not curse Thee to Thy face.' Originally the formula was one of imprecation, If such or such a thing does not happen, may evil befall me. In its present form it is incomplete, the invocation of evil being omitted. The phrase has thus become a strong assertion, 'he will certainly curse Thee' is the meaning here.

12. Yahweh accepts the challenge, not that He may prove Job, as He is said to have proved Israel, to see what was in his heart, but that He may vindicate His servant against the insinuations of the Satan. Nor have we any reason to think that His consent implies any wish to raise Job to a loftier level of virtue through the discipline of suffering. Job is already morally blameless, and in ii. 3 Yahweh asserts that it was at the Satan's instigation that the trial had been permitted. It was not in any solicitude for Job's character, but in the need for refuting the criticism of his piety, that we are to seek the reason for Yahweh's action. It should be observed that though the Satan had said 'Put forth thine hand,' Yahweh Himself will not smite. He permits the Satan to do it, but strictly limits his power, well aware of the relentless thoroughness with which His servant will do his work.

went forth: intent, like Judas, on his ghastly errand (John xiii. 30).

i. 13–22. On a day when the feast is in the eldest brother's house four successive messengers announce to Job the loss of his stock, his slaves, and his children. Job is utterly prostrate with grief, but blesses Yahweh, who, as He has given, has also the right to take away. Thus he emerges unscathed from his first trial.

13. Budde urges this verse against the view that Job's children feasted together every day, since in that case the Satan might

14 house, that there came a messenger unto Job, and said,
The oxen were plowing, and the asses feeding beside
15 them: and the Sabeans fell *upon them*, and took them
away; yea, they have slain the servants with the edge of
the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
16 While he was yet speaking, there came also another,
and said, The fire of God is fallen from heaven, and
hath burned up the sheep, and the servants, and con-

---

have availed himself of Yahweh's permission as soon as he had received it. But this does not follow. While Job's children were together every day, and could therefore at any time have been destroyed at a blow, the author meant to show that the catastrophe occurred on the very day when by Job's sacrifice any possible sin of his children had been expiated. He must leave no loophole for the explanation of the calamity as due to their sin or to Job's. Accordingly he must make the destruction take place when they met in the eldest brother's house, since on the morning of that day the sacrifices had been offered (verse 5). Besides, while the natural impression made by verse 13 is that an interval elapsed between the heavenly council and the ruin of Job, and this is confirmed by the different representation of the second trial in ii. 7, it may be pointed out that the author, both in i. 5 and ii. 1, introduces a fresh scene with the formula, 'And it came to pass on a day,' so that too much must not be inferred from it here, whereas in the second trial it would obviously have been less fitting to make the account of it a separate narrative.

14. In the four catastrophes that follow there is progression in the magnitude of the disasters. The first and third are inflicted by man, the second comes from heaven, and the fourth from the wilderness. Thus as he has been protected by God's hedge from assaults from any quarter, so, now the hedge is down, they are let loose on him from every quarter. Man, God, and the Powers of the Desert seem in league against him.

15. the Sabeans (Heb. *Sheba*) are nowhere else in the O. T. represented as a robber tribe. They are mentioned Gen. x. 7, 28, xxv. 3. The poet refers to them in vi. 19 as a trading people. Their home was in South-west Arabia.

One slave escapes from each disaster, since Job must learn what has befallen him, but only one, that his loss may be as complete as possible.

16. The fire of God is the lightning (2 Kings i. 12; Exod. ix. 23), here regarded as at the Satan's disposal.

sumed them ; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.
While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and 17
said, The Chaldeans made three bands, and fell upon
the camels, and have taken them away, yea, and slain
the servants with the edge of the sword ; and I only am
escaped alone to tell thee. While he was yet speaking, 18
there came also another, and said, Thy sons and thy
daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest
brother's house : and, behold, there came a great wind 19
from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the
house, and it fell upon the young men, and they are
dead ; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.

---

17. The Chaldeans (Heb. *Kasdim*) may be the people commonly so called, but if so, they are thought of as they were before they became the great conquering people who founded the later Babylonian empire. Hommel's suggestion, 'the men of Havilah,' is quite improbable. Possibly Cheyne's suggestion that for *Kasdim* we should read *Kassim*, i.e. the Kassites of Babylonia, may be correct. The attack, as often happened, was made on three sides, to prevent the escape of the camels.

fell (marg. 'made a raid'). In his *Thesaurus* Gesenius explains the word here translated (*pashat*) as meaning 'to spread out,' then with the preposition used here (*'al*), as 'to rush upon,' 'invade,' with a view to booty. Recent authorities generally take the original sense as 'to pull off,' 'to strip,' and then 'to plunder,' 'to make a plundering expedition.'

19. The winds from the desert were notorious for their violence. Since it struck the four corners of the house it must have been a whirlwind. The term **the young men** is, of course, intended to include the daughters, perhaps the servants as well, who in any case were destroyed. Cheyne says : 'His wife, however, by a touch of quiet humour, is spared ; she seems to be recognized by the Satan as an unconscious ally' (*Job and Solomon*, p. 14). But as she would naturally be in the house with Job, the device of the messenger could not have been adopted in her case, and the symmetry would have been spoiled. Besides, the author needed her for the later development of the story. She seems to have stood firm under the first trial, no small tribute to the piety of a mother, stabbed where she was most sensitive.

20 Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his
head, and fell down upon the ground, and worshipped;
21 and he said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb,
and naked shall I return thither: the LORD gave, and
the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of
22 the LORD. In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God
with foolishness.

---

20. His grief is deep and passionate, but while giving full expression to it he yields submissively to the will of God.

his mantle, rather 'his tunic,' the upper garment worn by people of rank.

and worshipped. For a beautiful parallel see the moving narrative in *Personal Memoirs of Dr. John Brown's Father.* 'We were all three awakened by a cry of pain—sharp, insufferable, as if one were stung.... We found my father standing before us, erect, his hands clenched in his black hair, his eyes full of misery and amazement, his face white as that of the dead. He frightened us. He saw this, or else his intense will had mastered his agony, for taking his hands from his head, he said, slowly and gently, "Let us give thanks," and turned to a little sofa in the room; there lay our mother, dead.'

21. Cf. Eccles. v. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 7. The thought is quite clear, naked I came into the world, naked I shall leave it, but the language in the latter part of it is inexact, and must not be prosaically interpreted.

The author puts the name **Yahweh** into Job's mouth, though in the speeches he avoids it (xii. 9 and xxviii. 28 probably constituting no real exceptions).

In direct reference to the Satan's prediction that Job would curse God, the author puts this word of blessing in his mouth, which not only expresses his piety in overwhelming distress, but his piety held fast in spite of his belief that it was Yahweh who was afflicting him.

22. The writer wishes to preclude the suspicion that in Job's grief there was the slightest element of murmuring against God. The last words of the verse are difficult. The word translated 'foolishness' properly means tastelessness, and we may accept the rendering 'foolishness,' laying stress on the moral rather than the intellectual associations of the word. The majority of commentators adopt the view of the clause taken in the R. V. It may mean, he uttered no folly against God (so the A. V. and Duhm), but though this gives a good sense, what is wanted is an expression of Job's judgement on God's conduct, rather than of the

Again there was a day when the sons of God came to 2
present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came
also among them to present himself before the LORD.
And the LORD said unto Satan, From whence comest 2
thou? And Satan answered the LORD, and said, From
going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and
down in it. And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou 3
considered my servant Job? for there is none like him
in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that
feareth God, and escheweth evil: and he still holdeth
fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him,
to destroy him without cause. And Satan answered the 4
LORD, and said, Skin for skin yea, all that a man hath

---

author's judgement on Job's language. The translation 'he gave God no occasion of offence' is adopted by Ewald, Dillmann, and Budde, but does not suit the context so well, for it is Job's feeling rather than God's which is in question, and the sense 'unpleasantness' is uncertain.

ii. 1–10. At a second heavenly assembly Yahweh challenges the Satan with Job's integrity, which he has vainly tried to discredit. The Satan answers that the man himself has escaped, let him be smitten in his own person, and he will curse God to His face. Yahweh permits him to inflict on Job this further trial, so he smites him from head to foot with an intolerable disease. Job repudiates, in noble resignation, his wife's suggestion that he should curse God; so once again the Satan's confident prediction is falsified.

3. The Satan makes no reference to his abortive attempt, perhaps because he was mortified at its failure. But when Yahweh twits him with it, he is at no loss for a reply.

although thou movedst me, i. e. in spite of your incitement to me to destroy him. But it would be better to translate 'so that thou movedst me,' i. e. since he holds fast his integrity it is plain that your attack on him has been futile. This agrees better with the object of the sentence, which is to assert the Satan's failure, and gives its proper emphasis to 'in vain,' which is preferable to 'without cause.' Yahweh repudiates responsibility for causing Job's former trial.

4. The rather vulgar language of the Satan is not exactly a sign of impudent familiarity, but the free speech of an old

5 will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now,
and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will renounce
6 thee to thy face. And the LORD said unto Satan, Be-
7 hold, he is in thine hand; only spare his life. So Satan
went forth from the presence of the LORD, and smote
Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his

---

servant, who does not wish to see his master imposed upon. Unfortunately the meaning of the proverb 'Skin for skin' is far from clear. Since 'for' translates in both cases the same Hebrew word, it must mean the same in both. It may mean 'in exchange for' or 'on behalf of.' Various views are suggested, a man gives one part of his skin to save another, or one limb for another, or one body for another, i. e. the body of another for his own. Duhm may be right in suggesting that the proverb arose among a people for whom skins were an important article of barter, and then gained a wider currency; the Beduin may have extorted his blackmail from the shepherd with this proverb, implying that if he wishes to save his own skin he must give the skins of his flock. So Job is skinned of all his possessions, thankful to escape with his own skin whole.

7. In this case the Satan smites at once when he leaves Yahweh's presence, since there is no need for him to wait. Job's disease is generally identified with elephantiasis, the symptoms of which are frequently mentioned in the references to the disease in the book. Though it ordinarily attacks the body by degrees, here it naturally attacks the whole body at once. This identification is not unanimously accepted. Prof. Macalister says: 'The characters given, however, agree better with those of the Biskra button, or Oriental sore, endemic along the southern shore of the Mediterranean and in Mesopotamia. This begins in the form of papular spots, which ulcerate and become covered with crusts, under which are itchy, burning sores, slow in granulation and often multiple: as many as forty have been found on one patient. It is probably due to a parasite, is communicable by inoculation, and very intractable even under modern treatment' (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 330). This view, again, is contested in *The Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, vol. xxxiv. pp. 268 ff. Dr. Thomas Chaplin identifies Job's disease with ecthyma, and certainly the description he quotes from Erasmus Wilson reminds the reader very forcibly of Job's symptoms. It is 'an eruption of large pustules dispersed over the body and limbs, beginning with itching and tingling, then bursting and forming a yellowish-grey scab. When the scab is

crown. And he took him a potsherd to scrape himself withal; and he sat among the ashes. Then said his wife unto him, Dost thou still hold fast thine integrity? renounce God, and die. But he said unto her, Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What? shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips.

---

removed a painful, ulcerated, and often sloughing surface is exposed, the crust which afterwards forms over it being black with thin and livid edges. It is slow in progress, very painful, and of long duration.' Dr. Masterman, of the English Mission Hospital, Jerusalem, communicates a note (pp. 278 ff.) in which he expresses agreement with Dr. Chaplin, and definitely rejects the identification with the Oriental boil, which is very common in Aleppo and Baghdad, and which, chronic and unresponsive to treatment, causes no great suffering.

8. It is not quite clear whether Job was sitting among the ashes in sign of grief for the loss of property and children when he was smitten with the disease, or whether, when the disease came, he went and sat on the ash-heap outside the city. The latter is perhaps the more probable. Macalister (l. c. p. 329) says that Job sat among the ashes to mitigate the itching, but it is usually thought that it was in sign of mourning for the new disaster, or else that he had to leave his home and sit on the ash-heap with the lepers.

9. The advice given to Job probably means, since this life of intolerable pain is all you get from God, curse God, that He may kill you outright, death being far better than the lingering torture to which you are now condemned.

10. By **foolish** is meant 'impious,' as in the margin (cf. Ps. xiv. 1). 'Wisdom' and 'folly' have in Hebrew a moral rather than an intellectual significance.

We should perhaps translate the second sentence, 'Good shall we receive from God, and evil shall we not receive?' with a strong emphasis on 'good.' It is a classical expression for the spirit of resignation, which recognizes God's right as He sends one, so also, if it be His will, to send the other.

with his lips. It is not meant that Job sinned in heart, though not in speech. It was a sin with the lips that the Satan had predicted, but Job, so far from cursing God to His face, rebukes the suggestion that he should do so as impious, and

11 Now when Job's three friends heard of all this evil that
was come upon him, they came every one from his own
place; Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite,
and Zophar the Naamathite: and they made an appoint-
ment together to come to bemoan him and to comfort
12 him. And when they lifted up their eyes afar off, and
knew him not, they lifted up their voice, and wept; and
they rent every one his mantle, and sprinkled dust upon
13 their heads toward heaven. So they sat down with him
upon the ground seven days and seven nights, and none
spake a word unto him: for they saw that his grief was
very great.

3 After this opened Job his mouth, and cursed his day.
2 And Job answered and said:

---

utters an expression of whole-hearted resignation. Thus the Satan is foiled once more, and is henceforth left out of account.

ii. 11–13. Job's three friends come to console him, and, after loud lamentations over his misery, sit in silence with him for seven days.

The visit of his friends naturally occurred some time later than his second trial. News of his misfortunes would have to reach them, and then the journey would probably occupy a rather long time. Eliphaz is an Edomite name (Gen. xxxvi. 4), and Teman is closely connected with Edom. On Bildad see note on i. 1. According to Nöldeke his name means 'Bel has loved.' Naamah can hardly be the Naamah in Judah, mentioned Josh. xv. 41, but where it was we do not know.

12. knew him not: he was so disfigured by his disease; cf. the description of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, 'so marred as not to be human was his visage,' Isa. lii. 14.

sprinkled dust. They flung heavenwards handfuls of dust, which fell on their heads.

13. His pain and the reverse of his fortunes strike them dumb, for when grief is so crushing, what form but silence can sympathy take?

iii. 1–10. Job curses the day of his birth and the night of his conception, praying that they may be blotted out of existence.

iii. 11–19. Why did he not die at his birth and enjoy the quiet which comes to all alike in Sheol?

Let the day perish wherein I was born, 3

iii. 20–26. Why must the wretched, who long to die, be forced to live? Such is his fate, victim as he is of unceasing troubles.

Through weary months of pain Job has brooded in silence on the cruel misery of his lot. Reduced in a day from wealth to beggary, bereaved at one stroke of all his children, smitten with an excruciating disease, tempted even by his dearest to curse God and have done with life, he had been nobly patient, submissive to God's inscrutable will. But, single-handed, he found it more and more difficult to subdue rebellious misgivings of the righteousness of God. Of his own integrity he was sure, but what of God, who rewarded with torture the loyalty of His servant? And in this trouble of his soul there had been no one to help him. The old way of escape to God had been cut off, even his wife had abandoned the struggle to hold fast her faith, the sufferer was driven back on himself. In the great conflict, in which faith and doubt wrestle strenuously for his soul, the rooted piety of a lifetime and the happy memory of God's goodness retreat, though stubbornly, before the agonizing present. He knows himself to be in danger of losing the fear of the Almighty. All the more eagerly does he clutch at his friends to keep him from sinking, only to find that he has clutched at a straw. He is at last in the presence of his peers, holy men, deeply sympathetic, bound to him by ties of long affection. At last the iron frost of his reserve can thaw in the genial sunshine of their compassion. Unmanned in their presence he can weep and not be ashamed, can 'cleanse his stuff'd bosom of the perilous stuff.' He can free his soul of all the bitterness that has festered in it, confident that his friends will not judge harshly his desperate words. They will know that frankness is best, will not misjudge it, but after he has uttered all he feels, will soothe him and strengthen him in his resignation to God's will. Vain hope! they are wise men, but no muttering of old saws will charm away this new disease, it is beyond their practice.

1. This chapter, as Cheyne reminds us (*Job and Solomon*, p. 15), was read by Swift on his birthday. It is modelled in its earlier part on Jeremiah's passionate imprecations on the day of his birth, and on the man who brought the news of it to his father (Jer. xx. 14–18).

2. answered: since silence was speech more significant than speech could have been.

3. Job breaks out in keen resentment at the bitter wrong in his birth, done to him by the day that he curses. According to the thought underlying the expression, a day did not cease to be when it was succeeded by the following day. The same day

And the night which said, There is a man child conceived.
4 Let that day be darkness;
Let not God regard it from above,

---

would return in the following year. 'The days of the year had a kind of life of their own (cf. Ps. xix. 2) and paid annually recurring visits to mankind' (Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 16). Hence it is no mere sentimental cursing of something which has passed into a nonentity where no curse can reach it, but of something which each year returns to work its malignant will. Filled with the thought of its foul crime in bringing him to the birth, Job imprecates extinction on it, that it may be fitly punished for its guilt in the past and inflict no more misery in the future. Job's complaint is not that he was born, but that it was this baneful day which gave him birth and doomed him to misery. Had he been born on a more fortunate day, life would have been happy for him. The thought is analogous to the astrological notion of birth under a lucky or unlucky star. To the unsophisticated feeling of antiquity the curse was not merely the discharge of anger, in relief to the feelings of him who uttered it, but filled with an inherent energy which strove to realize its own fulfilment. It was taken seriously, hence the sustained passion, solemnity, and comprehensiveness of it. But behind the day of birth lay the night of conception. The night also lives its own life, utters its pregnant words, which forward or hinder the act of man. Hence the night, which spoke the ominous words 'A man is conceived,' not only disclosed a secret, but uttered a mystic spell, which sealed Job's destiny to be conceived and born. We might also translate as in A. V. 'the night *in which* it was said.' But this is much weaker, and who is supposed to be able to say this? It would become more suitable if instead of 'a man is conceived' we followed several scholars in reading with the LXX 'Behold a boy' (*lit.* male). The form *hōrāh*, translated 'is conceived,' does not occur elsewhere. Nevertheless the Hebrew text gives a finer sense, and it is fitting that Job should curse not only the day of his birth, but the night of his conception.

man child: properly 'man,' looking at what he essentially is, not at the stage of developments he has reached.

4. Bickell, followed by Cheyne, strikes out the first line. It has no parallel. In that case what follows refers to the night mentioned in verse 3. This is also the case if, with the LXX, for 'that day' we read 'that night' (so Duhm, who thinks the parallel line is to be found in the second line of verse 9). The present text seems on the whole preferable; otherwise the night gets an undue share of the curse. The LXX reading is probably due to verse 3.

Neither let the light shine upon it.
Let darkness and the shadow of death claim it for their 5
own;
Let a cloud dwell upon it;
Let all that maketh black the day terrify it.
As for that night, let thick darkness seize upon it: 6
Let it not rejoice among the days of the year;
Let it not come into the number of the months.
Lo, let that night be barren; 7

---

regard (marg. 'inquire after'): *lit.* 'seek.' The days are summoned from their dwelling-place by God to play their part on earth and then return till their time comes again in the following year. So God commands the light, or the heavenly bodies, to come forth and take their appointed place (xxxviii; Isa. xl. 26). Let God pass this day over, when its turn arrives.

light: the word so rendered (*n^{e}harah*) occurs only here, and this is conjectured to be its meaning. Cheyne suggests *l^{e}banah*, a poetical word for the moon, 'let not the moon show her splendour above it.' This would require us to suppose that the night is here referred to. The poem, however, abounds in peculiar feminine nouns.

5. shadow of death (marg. 'deep darkness'). The margin represents the usual view of scholars, who think the word should be pointed *tsalmuth*. The R.V. text adopts the traditional theory that the word is correctly pointed *tsalmaweth* and means 'shadow of death.' This view has been recently defended by Nöldeke, who is followed by Marti, and whose arguments have convinced Budde (*Expos. Times*, viii. 384), who took the other view in his commentary. Wellhausen (*Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 81) rejects both.

all that maketh black. The word so translated occurs nowhere else. It is supposed to mean 'obscurations of,' and to be derived from a root meaning 'to be black,' whose existence, however, is dubious. The text may be incorrect. Cheyne very cleverly emends with slight alteration (*k^{e}mō 'ōr^{e}rē yām*) and gets the sense 'let them affright it like those who lay a ban on the ocean.' As thus restored the line is very like a variant of the first line of verse 8, and is accordingly deleted.

6. rejoice among. He means let it be excluded from the festive band of the days that make up the year. The marg. 'be joined unto' represents a different pointing. It is supported by the LXX and parallelism with the next clause, but is more prosaic.

7. barren (marg. 'solitary'): the word properly means 'stony.'

Let no joyful voice come therein.
8 Let them curse it that curse the day,
Who are ready to rouse up leviathan.
9 Let the stars of the twilight thereof be dark:
Let it look for light, but have none;
Neither let it behold the eyelids of the morning:

Here as in Isa. xlix. 21 it seems to mean 'barren.' Job wishes that it shall do to no others the wrong it did to him, let it be cursed with sterility, so that no shout of joy may ring out upon it for the birth of a child.

8. Usually the verse is explained of sorcerers, skilled to cause eclipses by rousing the dragon which catches the sun in its coils, who thus bring a curse upon the day. The superstition that eclipses are caused by a serpent is very widespread. Cheyne objects that we know of no magic to produce, but only to prevent, eclipses, and also that the usual interpretation involves an incomplete parallelism. He accepts a correction by Schmidt, also defended by Gunkel, and reads *yām* 'sea' for *yōm* 'day.' He translates, 'Let them curse it that lay a spell on the ocean, that have skill to arouse leviathan.' In this case the sea, as is not unusual in those passages in the O. T. which reflect the older mythology, is regarded as the primaeval enemy of God, now crushed into submission. In the ocean dwells leviathan, to be identified or connected with Tiamat, the chaos-dragon, who fought with and was conquered by the Creator. This is a tempting explanation, since it brings the passage into connexion with several others which have a similar reference. We should probably in that case explain that these sorcerers have the power to cast the dragon into slumber or to rouse it from its sleep. The reading of the text, which is retained by Budde and Duhm, has the advantage of a closer connexion with the context; Job thinks that the professional cursers of the day would perhaps more effectually help forward his desire. It is, of course, possible that the first and second lines are not connected, and that those who curse the day are not those who cause eclipses, but those who pronounce certain days in the calendar to be unlucky. On the whole it seems best to abide by the usual view.

ready: better as in marg. 'skilful.'

9. the stars of the twilight are the harbingers of the day. Job desires that as they promise in the morning twilight that the night shall soon be followed by the day, these prophets of the dawn should fade into darkness, and that day never come to do others the unpardonable wrong it has done to him.

eyelids of the morning. We have here the relic of a Dawn

Because it shut not up the doors of my *mother's* womb, 10
Nor hid trouble from mine eyes.
Why died I not from the womb? 11
Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly?
Why did the knees receive me? 12
Or why the breasts, that I should suck?
For now should I have lien down and been quiet; 13
I should have slept; then had I been at rest:

---

myth, as in Isa. xiv. 12, 'O day star, son of the Dawn.' The Dawn is thought of as a beautiful woman, and her eyelids are 'the long streaming rays of morning light that come from the opening clouds that reveal the sun, an exquisite image' (Davidson). Let the dayspring from on high never visit that night is Job's prayer.

10. This gives the reason for his curse, the night had not prevented his conception. If we read in verse 3 'Behold a man' (see note), the reason will be that the night had not prevented his birth. It might have done so by delaying the birth to a more auspicious day, or by slaying his mother, or, according to ancient ideas, slaying himself before birth (cf. Jer. xx. 17). Ley thinks we should translate, 'Because He (i. e. God) did not shut.' But the other is much finer and more forcible.

11. If he had to be born, why could he not immediately have died? Duhm brings verse 16 into immediate connexion with this verse, following Beer, and deletes verse 12. The latter suggestion is less plausible than the former, since it rests on the theory that the poem was composed in four-lined stanzas, which makes this section too long or too short by one couplet, though it is also true that verse 13 does not connect perfectly with verse 12.

12. It was the custom for the father to take the child on his knees after birth, if he meant to acknowledge it and make himself responsible for its maintenance. The verse means why, when he was born, was he not left to perish, abandoned by his father, unnourished by his mother?

13. From the tossing in agony which is his present lot he turns with a great longing to the deep unruffled peace of Sheol that might have been his. The conception of the after-life was of a dreary monotony, a bare existence without colour or interest, the dim shade, languid and strengthless dwelling amid other shades, in whom the flame of life flickered on but faintly, just escaping extinction. But for all its gloom, which Job himself

14 With kings and counsellors of the earth,
Which built up waste places for themselves;
15 Or with princes that had gold,
Who filled their houses with silver:
16 Or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been;
As infants which never saw light.

---

can paint in the darkest hues, Sheol has one attraction for him which outweighs in his present mood all the rich interest of life. There he would at least be at rest. It is true that if the after-life has for Job no other attractions, it has also no extreme terrors; it is a pale, negative, cheerless existence, but without any element of torture.

14. Had he died he would now have been dwelling with the mighty dead. The phrase 'to build waste places' is not uncommon, and means to repair cities that have fallen into desolation. But this sense is too general here, since Job is speaking of something they built for themselves. Ewald, followed by several scholars, including Budde and Duhm, thought the meaning was 'who built for themselves pyramids.' The sense 'pyramids,' however, cannot be proved, and the text is probably corrupt. The best emendation seems to be Cheyne's, 'who built everlasting sepulchres' (*qibrōth 'ōlām*). Fried. Delitzsch thinks there is a sarcastic allusion to the fact that kings often abandoned to ruin the cities built by their predecessors.

For Sheol as the home of the dead we may compare Lucretius as paraphrased by Mr. Mallock (*Lucretius on Life and Death*, p. 36).

'Ancus has gone before you down that road.
Scipio, the lord of war, the all-dreaded goad
Of Carthage, he, too, like his meanest slave
Has travelled humbly to the same abode.

Thither the singers and the sages fare,
Thither the great queens with their golden hair.
Homer himself is there with all his songs;
And even my Master's mighty self is there.

There, too, the knees that nursed you, and the clay
That was a mother once, this many a day
Have gone. Thither the king with crownèd brows
Goes, and the weaned child leads him on the way.'

15. The reference may be to princes who filled their palaces with wealth, or to those with whom great treasure was buried.

16. The child born dead is **hidden**, buried at once out of sight.

There the wicked cease from troubling; 17
And there the weary be at rest.
There the prisoners are at ease together; 18
They hear not the voice of the task-master.
The small and great are there; 19
And the servant is free from his master.
Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, 20
And life unto the bitter in soul;
Which long for death, but it cometh not; 21
And dig for it more than for hid treasures;

If, as is not unlikely, we should connect with verse 11, we should take it, 'Or why was I not as a hidden untimely birth.'

17. In this lovely picture of Sheol's calm, untroubled peace, it is not clear whether the wicked cease from tormenting others, or from agitating themselves. The former view is strongly suggested by verse 18, the latter is perhaps favoured by the second line of this verse (marg. 'raging').

18. Those who worked as captives under the pitiless lash and brutal insults of the overseer lie down to a rest they had not known on earth.

19. The inequalities of earth vanish in the dead level of society in Sheol. The slave has won his freedom, and his hard toil is for ever at an end. We should translate, 'Small and great are there the same,' i. e. all are in the same condition.

20. The exceeding sweetness of death only throws into relief the misery of his continued existence from which he cannot escape. And at length he ventures to utter the ominous word, which shows how far he has drifted from the old moorings, and strikes the note for much that is to follow: 'Wherefore does He give light?' We might translate impersonally as in R. V., but it is more probable that Job has God in his mind. The feeling forces itself to the surface that it is God who keeps him lingering in his pain. He hints in verse 23 that he owes his calamity to God. In vi. 4 the lecture he has received from Eliphaz drives him to say it outright. It is of his own bitterness that he is thinking most, though in the second line he widens his view to take in other wretches doomed to life, returning to his own in verse 23.

21. And dig for it more than for hid treasures. 'There is not another comparison within the whole compass of human actions so vivid as this. I have heard of diggers actually fainting when they have come upon even a single coin. They become positively

22 Which rejoice exceedingly,
And are glad, when they can find the grave?
23 *Why is light given* to a man whose way is hid,
And whom God hath hedged in?
24 For my sighing cometh before I eat,
And my roarings are poured out like water.
25 For the thing which I fear cometh upon me,
And that which I am afraid of cometh unto me.
26 I am not at ease, neither am I quiet, neither have I rest;
But trouble cometh.

4 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,

---

frantic, dig all night with desperate earnestness, and continue to work till utterly exhausted. There are, at this hour, hundreds of persons thus engaged all over the country. Not a few spend their last farthing in these ruinous efforts' (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 135).

22. exceedingly: marg. 'unto exultation.'

23. He no longer knows which way to turn. It is God who has thus baffled him. The poet lets the second line fall from Job's lips, that the reader may be reminded how in a very different sense the Satan also charged God with putting a hedge about Job. There protection, here arrest and bewilderment.

24. before I eat: this gives no suitable sense. The margin 'like my meat' is better, or we might translate, 'instead of my meat'; his sighing is his daily bread, cf. 'my tears have been my meat day and night.' Duhm omits the verse.

25. the thing which I fear cometh. We should translate, 'If I fear a fear, then it overtaketh me, and whatever I dread cometh upon me.' Such is his misery that he has only to dread some evil to find it overtaking him. The margin, 'the thing which I feared is come,' gives a wrong sense, for Job's happiness in his time of prosperity was not undermined with dread of the future. Rather, 'I said, I shall die in my nest' (xxix. 18). Similarly the past tenses in the margin of verse 26 give an incorrect sense.

iv, v. Through seven days the friends have sat in silence, while the sufferer has been writhing in his pain. They, too, have no clue to its meaning, but only their general theory of life and their former acquaintance with Job to guide them. And these forces pulled in opposite directions, the former suggested that such

If one assay to commune with thee, wilt thou be grieved? 2

accumulated sufferings implied some heinous sin as its cause, while the latter testified to his integrity. Yet not only have they watched his demeanour during the seven days of silence, but they have heard his deep imprecations, his bitter complaint at his birth, his longing for death, even the hint that God is responsible for his trouble. This speech, which was no balanced, calculated utterance, but the wild outpouring of a desperate man's soul, pained and shocked his friends, who heard and criticized in cold blood. They still believed in Job's essential piety, but felt that other elements had also to be reckoned with. Some grievous sin must lie behind his suffering; moreover, the temper in which he was bearing his punishment was wholly unbecoming to a religious man. There is no fault to be found with Eliphaz for the tone of his speech. It is very considerate and tender; but his theology has misled his diagnosis. Hence it served only to exasperate Job into open revolt, and thus to lead the friends to a darker view of his state. So the breach widens and the character-drama develops, as the factors implicit in the situation become clearly defined.

iv. 1–11. Eliphaz cannot refrain from replying to Job. How strange that one who has sustained others should break down himself at the touch of trouble. His integrity should give him confidence, for experience shows that the innocent do not perish, but it is the wicked who are consumed by the blast of God's anger.

iv. 12—v. 8. The speaker has himself learnt in an awe-inspiring vision that not even the angels, and how much less frail mankind, can be accounted righteous by God. The foolish comes to an evil end through impatience.

v. 9–16. Job would do far better to commit his cause to God, who, mighty in power and inscrutable in wisdom, exalts the lowly and overthrows the crafty in their scheming.

v. 17–26. How blessed the man whom God chastens, so let Job receive humbly the chastening God inflicts on him. For if He smites, it is but to heal him, and bestow the richest happiness upon him, delivering him from all misfortune and blessing him with the fullest prosperity, his long life rounded off with green old age and a quiet death.

2. wilt thou be grieved: *lit.* 'wilt thou be weary.' The word may refer to physical weariness; is Job too ill to listen to remonstrance? Or it may be metaphorical, in which case it may mean either to be vexed, or to be discouraged. The context suggests that it is not of physical exhaustion that he is thinking. Although he feels that he may irritate or depress his friend, the tone of Job's speech leaves him no alternative but to reply.

But who can withhold himself from speaking?
3 Behold, thou hast instructed many,
And thou hast strengthened the weak hands.
4 Thy words have upholden him that was falling,
And thou hast confirmed the feeble knees.
5 But now it is come unto thee, and thou faintest;
It toucheth thee, and thou art troubled.
6 Is not thy fear *of God* thy confidence,
And thy hope the integrity of thy ways?
7 Remember, I pray thee, who *ever* perished, being innocent?
Or where were the upright cut off?
8 According as I have seen, they that plow iniquity,

3, 4. It is the more surprising that Job should give way, since he has in the past so effectively strengthened the suffering and despondent. With his clear, deep insight into the ways of God he had helped the wavering and steadied them when tempted to rebel at the mysterious harshness of God's dealings with them. Let him now apply to his own case the lessons he has so successfully taught to others. What Eliphaz fails to understand is that Job's disease needs not an irritant but an emollient. A vivid realization of the pain he is suffering, the imagination which will enable him to put himself in Job's place, a tender sympathy, a generous comprehension, these were the qualities that would have soothed the sufferer and rekindled his flickering trust in God. 'To him that is ready to faint kindness *should be shewed* from his friend' (vi. 14). 'A glimmering wick he will not quench.'

5. 'One would really suppose Job to have broken down at the first taste of trouble' (Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 18).

6, 7. Eliphaz means quite seriously that Job is a pious and upright man. Grave slips may, indeed, have tarnished his record, yet he is genuinely good, the set and drift of his soul are towards God and righteousness. Then let this conscious integrity be his encouragement. For if he will bethink himself of the teachings of history and experience, he will discover that the upright do not perish, discipline and punishment are not pushed to the point of destruction. 'Fear of God' recalls the description of Job as 'one that feared God'; 'the integrity of thy ways' recalls 'that man was perfect and upright.'

8. Rather, as Eliphaz can testify from his own experience, it is

And sow trouble, reap the same.
By the breath of God they perish, 9
And by the blast of his anger are they consumed.
The roaring of the lion, and the voice of the fierce lion, 10
And the teeth of the young lions, are broken.
The old lion perisheth for lack of prey, 11
And the whelps of the lioness are scattered abroad.
Now a thing was secretly brought to me, 12
And mine ear received a whisper thereof.

---

those who deliberately sow mischief, after carefully preparing the ground to receive it, who invariably reap a harvest of trouble. Cf. Hos. viii. 7, x. 13.

9. Their destiny is to **perish** in the wrath of God. Job, it is true, might seem to have sunk into trouble as deep as that referred to in verse 8. But as his life has been different, so also will be his fate; he will not 'perish' as they do (verse 7).

10, 11. The wicked are compared with a den of lions, and their destruction with an attack made upon it. In this attack the lions are not slain, but the teeth of the fully-grown are broken. No longer able to seize and devour his prey, the lion dies of hunger, and the cubs which cannot provide for themselves, and have lost the care of their dam, are scattered abroad. Five different words are used here. 'Fierce lion' is rather roaring or hoarse lion. 'Young lions' are lions in their early vigour. Elzas says, 'The Arabs boast that they have four hundred names by which to designate the lion.' Similarly G. E. Post, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 126.

Merx and Siegfried strike out verses 10, 11, and Duhm thinks verses 8–11 are a later interpolation. It is true that the drift of them is not quite clear, as they might be intended to suggest that Job's calamity is due to his sin, and hold up a warning picture of the fate to which he is moving. If so, the verses are probably not original here, for this is not the position Eliphaz takes up at this stage of the debate. But it seems quite easy to suppose that here Eliphaz is contrasting Job's case with that of the wicked, and the strictly unnecessary amplification in verses 10, 11 has parallels elsewhere.

12. He enforces the truth upon Job that no creature can be spotless in God's sight, not even the angels, who are pure spirit, far less men, formed out of the dust and so frail that they are crushed with ease. This lesson he had learnt for himself in an experience the horror of which is renewed as he relates it. The description

13 In thoughts from the visions of the night,
When deep sleep falleth on men,
14 Fear came upon me, and trembling,
Which made all my bones to shake.

---

of it ranks with the most wonderful triumphs of genius in the world's literature. This is displayed less in the delineation of the physical effects of terror than in the power with which the poet conveys a sense of the vague and impalpable, and the awe inspired by the wholly-felt but dimly known. The revelation came stealthily to him, and fell on his ear in a whisper, with all the dread which gathers about the secret uttered in a tone which the listener alone can hear. Already his mind had been engaged in deep pondering, arising from visions he had seen in the entranced sleep of the seer. As he meditates, he is suddenly seized with a panic, which causes all his limbs to tremble. Then a breath moves across his face, deepening his horror of the uncanny visitant. The nameless thing stands still, and seeking to know the worst, he strains his eyes to make out the figure before him. But he can see nothing, except that some form is there; all is dim and intangible, making his heart quail with the dread of the unknown. Then, as he lies helpless in the grip of his fear, he is conscious of a voice, which just breaks the awful stillness, and teaches him the lesson he now impresses on Job.

13. Eliphaz is a seer who is privileged to see night visions. He does not mean that while ordinary men were wrapped in deep slumber he was receiving visions in a state of wakefulness. The night is the season when the deep sleep of trance falls upon the clairvoyant, when the senses are blunted to the external world, but the spirit is the more sensitive to the things which lie beyond the realm of sight. It is thus in the quiet evening when the tumult of the day dies down, or in the intenser stillness of the night, that the seer, no longer distracted by the cares and bustle of the world, finds the inward eye open to see its visions. Thus the author of the very interesting, and, for the psychological conditions of the prophetic state, important passage, Isa. xxi. 1–10, speaks of 'the twilight that I desired' (verse 4). Eliphaz was meditating on what he had seen in his trances, when the experience he proceeds to describe befell him. It was not of the same character as his visions, but came to him when he was fully awake (cf. Isa. l. 4).

14. First of all comes the terror, with no apparent cause; here the description has often been verified in similar experiences, the sudden sense of the presence being felt before it has made itself manifest to ear, eye, or touch.

Then a spirit passed before my face; 15
The hair of my flesh stood up.
It stood still, but I could not discern the appearance 16
thereof;
A form was before mine eyes:
There was silence, and I heard a voice, *saying*,
Shall mortal man be more just than God? 17
Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?
Behold, he putteth no trust in his servants; 18

15. a spirit passed before. This translation may be correct, and it is adopted by Ewald and Duhm. But more probably we should translate as in the margin, 'a breath passed over'; the cold wind which is said to be felt in such experiences. The speaker slips into the imperfect tense, here equivalent to our present, as the old horror masters him and he shudders once again with vivid realization, 'a breath passes over my face,' &c.

16. If we translate 'a breath' in verse 15, the subject of the verb is left unexpressed. 'It stood still' thus creates a far more powerful impression than if Eliphaz had named it. It is unnamed because it is unknown, and thus the vagueness, which characterizes the description, here also heightens the terror. The last words are usually translated as in the margin, 'I heard a still voice,' the two nouns 'silence and a voice' being taken as a hendiadys. The translation 'there was stillness and I heard a voice' yields a finer sense, the dead hush and then the voice. That the voice was faint and thin we know already from verse 12. So the spirits of the dead chirp and mutter, Isa. viii. 19. The revelation came to Elijah with a still small voice, which stood in striking contrast to the crash and roar of the elements, here the low voice is in contrast to the utter stillness that had preceded it.

17. After so awestruck an introduction we expect an original and impressive revelation. This we do not get according to the R. V. text. So trivial a commonplace as that man is not more righteous than God needed no vision to declare it; and it is quite irrelevant in this connexion. No one maintains the opposite; it is only at a later stage that Job impugns the righteousness of God. We should therefore translate as in the margin, 'be just before God,' 'be pure before his Maker.' The translation, adopted by Kautzsch, 'can man be right as against God?' would also suit better a later stage in the discussion.

18. The **servants** of God are, as the next line shows, the angels. The angelology of the O. T. and of Jewish theology,

And his angels he chargeth with folly:
19 How much more them that dwell in houses of clay,
Whose foundation is in the dust,
Which are crushed before the moth!
20 Betwixt morning and evening they are destroyed:
They perish for ever without any regarding it.
21 Is not their tent-cord plucked up within them?
They die, and that without wisdom.

---

largely also of the N.T., does not recognize the distinction between good and evil angels (see note on i. 6). We should therefore take this passage in its obvious sense, and not force it into harmony with later views.

folly. The word so translated (*tohŏlāh*) occurs only here, so that its meaning is uncertain. According to Dillmann it is connected with an Ethiopic verb meaning 'to err.' In that case the word will mean 'error.' It is not unlikely that we should correct the text slightly and read *tiphlāh*, the word translated 'foolishness' in i. 22.

19. Since the angels are spirit, they are more akin to God than men are, for the latter are material, dwelling in bodies made of clay, rooted in the earthy. As such, men are also exposed to physical sins, to which spiritual beings would not, it might seem, be tempted. Yet the narrative in Gen. vi. 1–4 shows that Hebrew thought regarded it as possible for the *elohim*, spirit though they were, to be tempted by sensual passion, and lead Yahweh to declare that this unhallowed mixture of spirit and flesh should not continue. The reason for man's impurity in God's sight is his material nature, the physical is also the morally frail. An instructive parallel is Ps. lxxviii. 39, 'And he remembered that they were but flesh; A wind that passeth away, and cometh not again.'

foundation: i. e. of the houses, carrying on the metaphor.

before the moth: the meaning may be sooner than the moth is crushed, but this is improbable. It would be better to translate 'like' as in the margin, and perhaps in iii. 24; cf. Ps. xxxix. 11. Fried. Delitzsch thinks that the word translated 'moth' is a distinct word, meaning a flimsy structure of some kind.

20. Their brief life does not span the period from sunrise to sunset, and when they die no one observes an event so trifling. The first words of the verse are more literally rendered in the margin 'from morning to evening'; cf. Isa. xxxviii. 12.

21. The margin translates, 'Is not their excellency which is in them removed?' But the text is better, death is compared to the

Call now; is there any that will answer thee? 5
And to which of the holy ones wilt thou turn?
For vexation killeth the foolish man, 2

plucking up of a tent-cord and taking down of the tent. Here again cf. Isa. xxxviii. 12. Further, man is so constituted that as he lives so he dies without attaining wisdom.

v. **1.** The verse seems to mean that it would be useless for Job to appeal to the angels against God. It would be an exhibition of impotent wrath, that, as verse 2 proceeds to say, would lead to his destruction. It seems strange, however, that Eliphaz should suppose Job to contemplate such a course, accordingly Duhm, following Siegfried, strikes out the verse, connecting v. 2 closely with iv. 21. But this connexion is only superficially good. For iv. 21 speaks of the common lot of frail man; v. 2 ff., of the destruction of the fool through his own irritation. Besides, the verse is too striking for a glossator, and how should he have inserted it in a context apparently so inappropriate? When we look more closely into the context we discover points of connexion. Eliphaz has already explained that the angels are so imperfect that God puts no trust in them, and charges them with folly (iv. 18). The thought of the close connexion between God and the angels on one side, and man and the angels on the other, led not unnaturally to the thought that the angels might intercede for man, a thought that may be expressed by Elihu (xxxiii. 23), and is found in Enoch. It was, therefore, not wholly unnatural for Eliphaz to warn Job against being driven by his desperation to invoke the angels. This warning finds its completion in verse 8, so that the general thought would be, Do not appeal to the angels who cannot help you, and thus draw down the penalty of your exasperation, but commit your cause to the all-powerful omniscient God, who can save you out of your distress. The case is parallel with the exhortation given by Paul to the Colossians that they should not worship angels who are themselves far from perfect, and powerless to help, but the all-sufficient Saviour in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells. On the possible relation of verse 7 to this verse, see note on verses 6, 7.

the holy ones. This designation of the angels is often thought to suggest that they, pure beings as they are, would turn with abhorrence from one who thus appealed to them. But probably 'holy' has here no ethical significance; it would be strange if it had, after iv. 18. Budde's translation 'heavenly ones' brings out the meaning more correctly. They are supernatural beings, who live superior to the material limitations of earth. That is why Job might not unreasonably appeal to them.

2. Reason why Job should not appeal to the angels: it would

And jealousy slayeth the silly one.
3 I have seen the foolish taking root:
But suddenly I cursed his habitation.
4 His children are far from safety,
And they are crushed in the gate,
Neither is there any to deliver them.

---

be a manifestation of temper that would lead to his death. True, Job longed for death, and might be tempted to turn from God to the angels, feeling that in any case, whether it brought death or release from pain, his lot could not be worse. Eliphaz, however, looks forward to Job's restoration and long life, and therefore bids him not let his exasperation so master him that he flings his chances away.

jealousy: the margin 'indignation' suits the context much better.

3. It is generally agreed that the second half of the verse needs correction. In its present form its meaning is not clear. It may be, 'I foresaw and pronounced his doom,' but this does not suit 'suddenly'; why should he have uttered his prediction suddenly? This objection does not lie against the view that he saw the stroke of judgement fall, and then declared that it was God's curse which was being executed, since in that case the curse is uttered in consequence of a sudden catastrophe. But this is not the natural sense of the passage, which is rather, 'I saw him flourish, but I cursed his habitation, and it was blasted in consequence of my curse.' Here again 'suddenly' is not suitable, and in spite of the power believed to lie in a curse, it is not likely that the speaker means that he effected the ruin of the foolish. He is illustrating from his own experience the principle enunciated in verse 2; he is naturally therefore only an observer of, not an agent in, the destruction. We rather expect a mention of the actual fate that befell the foolish thus suddenly. Several emendations have been proposed. An easy one is to read, 'but suddenly his habitation became rotten.' Since 'rotten,' however, is not very appropriate to 'habitation,' we might possibly do better to correct the latter word also, with Cheyne, and read, 'but suddenly his branch became rotten,' thus securing a correspondence with 'taking root' in the previous line. Budde reads 'became empty.'

4. Fate of his orphans. Deprived of their once powerful protector, the children are exposed to many perils, are too weak to help letting themselves be crushed (this is the sense of the Hithpael) in the gate, where the administration of justice is at the mercy of the strong arm and the long purse.

Whose harvest the hungry eateth up, 5
And taketh it even out of the thorns,
And the snare gapeth for their substance.
For affliction cometh not forth of the dust, 6

5. For **Whose harvest** we might better read 'what they have reaped' (so many scholars with LXX). They cannot secure their grain against theft.

even out of the thorns: as usually explained the meaning is that they break through the thorn hedge into the field to plunder the corn. But this is not very probable; why should they trouble to do this in order to get into the field? Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 348) suggests other explanations, either they 'leave nothing behind them, not even that which grew among thorns,' or the reference is to the custom of farmers to lay aside the grain after threshing in some private place near the floor, 'and cover it up with thorn-bushes to keep it from being carried away or eaten by animals. Robbers who found and seized this would literally take it from among thorns.' Several scholars think the original text is not preserved, but no satisfactory emendation has been proposed. Bickell and Duhm strike out the clause, which does not suit the scheme of four-lined stanzas.

the snare gapeth for their substance. This yields no very satisfactory sense. Budde retains it in his translation, and Davidson thinks it is safest, though he admits that it is 'rather vague and colourless.' Generally the view, mentioned in the margin as adopted by 'many ancient versions,' that instead of 'the snare gapeth' we should translate 'the thirsty swallow up,' is accepted. We thus get a parallel to 'the hungry eateth up' in the first line. But this is open to a double objection, the verb is singular, while the noun is plural, so that some correction is required, and the line 'the thirsty swallow their substance' would in any case be infelicitous, but doubly so when parallel to literal eating by the hungry in the first line. But instead of inferring from this that we had better put up with the unsatisfactory line 'the snare gapeth for their substance,' it is surely better to get a perfect parallelism by correcting 'substance' into something which satisfies the thirsty as the harvest satisfies the hungry, some form of drink, as that was some form of food. Either Duhm's 'and the thirsty draws from their well,' or Beer's 'and the thirsty drink their milk,' yields a good sense and parallelism with slight emendation. The latter is perhaps preferable.

6, 7. These verses are far from clear. They are often supposed to deny the spontaneous origin of human trouble; it does not

Neither doth trouble spring out of the ground;
7 But man is born unto trouble,
As the sparks fly upward.

---

spring like weeds from the ground, but arises out of the evil conduct of men. The connexion would seem to be, I have seen the unrighteous fall suddenly from prosperity to ruin, for trouble does not come without a cause. This is not a very good logical connexion; we should rather have expected, I have seen the ruin of the unrighteous, for sin does not fail to have its effect. Budde explains that Eliphaz argues back here from effect to cause, rather than, as we should expect, from cause to effect, because the effect, i.e. Job's affliction, constituted his starting-point. But, apart from the logical inversion, of which it is questionable whether Budde's explanation is satisfactory, it is noteworthy that the thought is so obscurely expressed. To say that trouble does not spring from the dust means that trouble does not arise without a cause is precarious, but it is still more so to read in the further thought that this cause is man's own sin. In iv. 19 we learn that the moral defect of men is due partly to the fact that like the angels they are creatures, partly to the fact that unlike them they dwell in bodies formed of dust. But Duhm is hypercritical when he argues that this implies, in contradiction to our verse, that trouble does spring out of the dust. The uncertainty of meaning is enhanced by the fact that verse 7 is capable of so many interpretations. The word translated 'is born' may be pointed in five different ways, but the main question is whether we should translate 'man is born to trouble' or 'man begets trouble.' The former view is that usually taken, but the latter is also possible; the meaning would then be that man has himself to thank for the trouble he has to suffer. The sense of the second line is even more uncertain. As the margin indicates, the word translated 'sparks' is more literally 'the sons of flame *or* of lightning.' If we adopt the usual view, that the phrase means 'sparks,' the meaning will be, just as surely as sparks fly upward. But it is not at all certain that it does mean 'sparks.' Cheyne suggested 'burning arrows' shot high in the air and ready to fall on the guilty. Some think the reference is to birds; Siegfried, indeed, corrects the text and reads 'the eagle race' (*nesher* for *resheph*). Fried. Delitzsch explains that they are men who are all fire and flame, blind zealots who fly on high and vanish without a trace. It is possible that Schlottmann and G. Hoffmann have best hit the meaning, they take 'the race of flame' to be angels (the Targum had similarly explained that they are demons). It is quite true that we cannot establish this sense by any parallels, though the angels are closely connected with the stars. It fits in

But as for me, I would seek unto God, 8
And unto God would I commit my cause:
Which doeth great things and unsearchable; 9
Marvellous things without number:
Who giveth rain upon the earth, 10
And sendeth waters upon the fields:
So that he setteth up on high those that be low; 11

well with the general context. In verse 1 Eliphaz has condemned recourse to the angels, here he gives the reason, they soar far above human trouble, and continues, in verse 8, I would in your case commit myself to God. This is not to be refuted by pointing out the prevalence of a belief in the intercession of angels, for Eliphaz may be directly controverting it. The suggestion might perhaps be hazarded that the text may at one time have expressed clearly the contrast which is now dimly present in 'from the dust' and 'soar on high.' Are we not following the wrong clue in explaining 'not from the dust' to mean 'without a cause'? The contrast suggested by 'not from the dust' is that trouble comes from on high (cf. Longfellow's 'these severe afflictions Not from the ground arise'). The 'race of flame' might in that case conceivably be regarded as the author of human trouble. Or possibly verse 6 may have originally said that trouble does spring from the dust, therefore (verse 7) man is doomed to it by the conditions of his earthly life, but the angels escape since they soar high above earth. It is not possible to feel any confidence as to the meaning, but the verses strike one as too powerful and original to favour Wellhausen's view, accepted by Beer, Siegfried, and Duhm, that they are an interpolation.

8. Now Eliphaz passes from this assertion of the folly of irritation and urges him to entrust his cause to God. The Hebrew expresses with much emphasis the contrast between what Job is doing and what the speaker would do in his place. He has so little sounded the depths of Job's trouble as to be unaware that Job felt his way to God cut off.

9. God's greatness and power should be the ground of Job's confidence in appealing to Him.

11. So that he setteth up. If this is closely connected with verse 10, the sense yielded by this translation or by the more obvious rendering of the A. V. 'to set up' is not at all satisfactory. We need not on that account strike out verse 10, with Duhm, as foreign to the argument and breaking the connexion between verses 8, 9 and verses 11, 12; for verse 11 may refer to the general idea of verses 9, 10. It is possible to translate 'setting up,'

And those which mourn are exalted to safety.
12 He frustrateth the devices of the crafty,
So that their hands cannot perform their enterprise.
13 He taketh the wise in their own craftiness:
And the counsel of the froward is carried headlong.
14 They meet with darkness in the day-time,
And grope at noonday as in the night.
15 But he saveth from the sword of their mouth,
Even the needy from the hand of the mighty.

---

co-ordinating the clause with what precedes, as a fresh example of God's working. The truth expressed is general, but there is also a special reference to Job's case.

12. A favourite idea of Hebrew wisdom that, while God exalts the lowly, He brings to nought the plans of the haughty.

cannot perform their enterprise, marg. 'can perform nothing of worth.' The word translated **enterprise** (*tushiyyāh*) belongs to the technical vocabulary of the Wisdom Literature, and is found with two exceptions (Isa. xxviii. 29; Mic. vi. 9) only in Job and Proverbs. A root *yashah* is generally assumed for it, but as it nowhere occurs, and its meaning is disputed, this gives us no clue to the sense of the derivative. Some make the idea of wisdom, rationality, prominent, but the context here and in vi. 13 favours the meaning success, something substantial and effectual. In both places the new Oxford Lexicon renders 'abiding success.'

13. The quotation from this verse in 1 Cor. iii. 19 is the only quotation from Job in the New Testament.

14. Cf. Deut. xxviii. 29. They are struck intellectually with darkness and grope as the men of Sodom or Elymas did literally when struck with physical darkness (Gen. xix. 11; Acts xiii. 11; cf. 2 Kings vi. 18–20).

15. It seems clear that the text is corrupt. The usual parallelism is wanting, and the words 'he saveth the poor from the sword, from their mouth' yield no satisfactory sense. They are explained 'from the sword, i.e. their mouth,' or 'from the sword which comes out of their mouth,' or 'from the sword, which is their mouth,' i. e. their instrument of devouring. Several point the consonants of the word translated 'from the sword' differently (*moḥōrāb* for *mēḥereb*). Thus we should get the sense, 'But he saves the desolate from their mouth, and, from the hand of the mighty, the poor.' This is generally rejected now on the ground that this word 'desolate' is elsewhere used only of cities, never

So the poor hath hope, 16
And iniquity stoppeth her mouth.
Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth: 17
Therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty.
For he maketh sore, and bindeth up; 18
He woundeth, and his hands make whole.
He shall deliver thee in six troubles; 19

---

of persons. Some omit the second 'from,' 'he saves from the sword of their mouth.' The word translated 'the poor' comes in the Hebrew at the end of the second line, and we need a similar word in the first line to balance it. Budde strikes out 'from the sword' and inserts 'the orphan' after 'from their mouth,' so that the verse would run, 'he saves from their mouth the orphan, and, from the hand of the mighty, the poor.' Siegfried reads, 'he saves from the sword the needy, and, from the hand of the mighty, the poor.' Either of these is an improvement on the present text.

16. The second line occurs in a very similar form in Ps. cvii. 42. The wicked are dumb with confusion when they see the ignominious failure of their schemes, and the exaltation of the despised, whose ruin they had been contriving.

17. And now, in a beautiful and glowing peroration, Eliphaz depicts the happiness of him who is chastened by God, and paints a lovely picture of the blessedness awaiting Job, if he receives God's chastisement aright. Yet for all its sweet and soothing eloquence and promise of idyllic peace, the noble rhetoric rings hollow to Job's ear. For its fundamental assumption is that Job's suffering is punishment for sin, and his restoration conditional on meek submission to God's discipline. Thus the words, which were meant to be healing, make his wounds smart the more. For how could he believe such comforting assurances, when his experience taught him only too plainly how God could torture the blameless? The thought of the blessedness of the man whom God chastens is not unusual in the later Hebrew literature. A close parallel with the present verse is Prov. iii. 11, 12, which is quoted Heb. xii. 5, 6. Cf. Ps. xciv. 12, and the development given to the thought in the speeches of Elihu.

18. Cf. Hos. vi. 1, Deut. xxxii. 39. God's drastic surgery is for the sufferer's higher good, and the hand that uses the knife without flinching is also the gentle hand that tenderly binds up the wound.

19. The description that follows reminds one rather strikingly

Yea, in seven there shall no evil touch thee.
20 In famine he shall redeem thee from death;
And in war from the power of the sword.
21 Thou shalt be hid from the scourge of the tongue;
Neither shalt thou be afraid of destruction when it cometh.
22 At destruction and dearth thou shalt laugh;
Neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth.
23 For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field;
And the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee.

---

of the exquisite ninety-first Psalm. The thrilling language is that of a truly pious man who feels deeply the truths he is expounding, and would fain uplift Job with the confidence that inspires him as he speaks. Once more God's hedge will be about him so that no evil can touch him.

21. We might translate, 'when the tongue lasheth.' The sense is good, though, as Duhm points out, we should rather in this context have expected a noun meaning 'pestilence.' Possibly the text originally read this. We should then have the 'four sore judgements,' enumerated by Ezekiel: 'the sword, and the famine, and the noisome beasts, and the pestilence' (Ezek. xiv. 21, cf. verses 13–19; v. 17). Pestilence and destruction also occur in Ps. xci. 6. For 'destruction' in this verse Hoffmann reads 'a demon' (*shēd* for *shōd*). This strikes a modern reader as rather grotesque, but to the ancients it was more serious. The 'terror by night' was more real to them, and even to day Lilith has not ceased to be a peril dreaded by many Jews. There is no need to alter the pointing, though if it is retained the repetition of 'destruction' in verse 22 is curious.

22. Neither shalt thou be afraid: the translation misses a point here. The negative is not the same as that used in verse 21. That simply expressed the fact 'thou shalt not fear.' This imports into the thought the speaker's point of view, 'thou needest not fear.'

23. There runs through much of the Old Testament a deep sense of the sympathy between man and nature, which often finds expression in the prophetic descriptions of the happy future. Here the thought is poetically expressed that he need not fear famine (verse 22), for the stones will keep out of his field. It can surely hardly be meant that the very stones will bring forth corn and fruit, we might in that case compare Matt. iii. 9, iv. 3. Paul also thinks of the lot of Nature as inextricably bound up with that

And thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace ;
And thou shalt visit thy fold, and shalt miss nothing.
Thou shalt know also that thy seed shall be great,
And thine offspring as the grass of the earth.
Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age,
Like as a shock of corn cometh in in its season.
Lo this, we have searched it, so it is ;
Hear it, and know thou it for thy good.

Then Job answered and said,

---

of man, and catches the undertone of pain with which she groans, waiting for that redemption which can come only with man's complete adoption (Rom. viii. 19–22). Cf. also, for the second line, Isa. xi. 6–9.

24. For **fold** the marg. gives 'habitation,' for **shalt miss nothing**, it gives 'shalt not err.' The text is in both cases preferable.

25. From the conventional list of earthly blessings a numerous posterity could not be absent, so Eliphaz, carried away by his own eloquence, includes it here, forgetting that Job's children had all been destroyed. It is not likely that the poet means him to predict consciously what we read in xlii. 13, though it would be quite in his manner to put an unconscious prediction in the mouth of one of the friends. He rather suggests that Eliphaz's consolation is too conventional.

26. a full age: the word so translated occurs only here and in xxx. 2. It probably means 'a ripe old age.' Eliphaz can hold out no hope beyond the grave, but promises all that is possible, a long life and death without the failure of powers that usually attends old age. In the Epilogue we are told that after his restoration Job lived twice the threescore years and ten that are assigned in Ps. xc. 10 as the normal limit of man's whole life.

27. Looking back, not simply on his peroration but on his whole speech, Eliphaz affirms that it embodies the investigations into truth of himself and his friends, and bids Job lay it to heart.

Hear it: we should probably read with the LXX, 'we have heard it,' the Hebrew text being strange. No change in the consonants is involved.

vi. 1–13. Job begins his reply to Eliphaz with the wish that his pain might be balanced against his irritation, for then his desperate words would be abundantly justified. It is God who has drunk his strength with poisoned arrows, God's terrors that are arrayed against him. The animals do not complain without reason, no

2 Oh that my vexation were but weighed,
And my calamity laid in the balances together!
3 For now it would be heavier than the sand of the seas:
Therefore have my words been rash.

---

more does he. He loathes his afflictions. Oh that God would slay him outright! he cannot endure his sufferings.

vi. 14–30. In his despair he had looked to his friends for kindness, but had been bitterly disappointed. They were like streams, which offered abundant supply of water in the winter when they were not needed, but in the summer betrayed the caravans, which trusted in them to be saved from death. Job had not asked a gift or protection from them. Their arguments are worthless; they take too seriously the wild words of despair; they are devoid of pity. Let them receive the solemn assurance of his innocence.

vii. 1–21. How hard is man's lot! Job's life is one of misery, swiftly speeding him in wretchedness to irretrievable death. So he will speak plainly out of his soul's bitterness: Why should God watch him as if he were dangerous, and plague him with such torments? Is man of such moment that God must needs spy on all his actions? can Job's sin hurt God? why does not God freely forgive him, before forgiveness is too late?

The bitter complaint of the third chapter had elicited reproof rather than sympathy. Eliphaz had condemned Job's impatience, ignoring his provocation, and had hinted that his trouble was occasioned by his sin. Such treatment shocked and angered the sufferer; it drove him into open criticism of God and scornful denunciation of his friends, both mingled with touching and pitiful appeal. Conscious of his own integrity he could not understand how his trusted friends could question it. His full misery comes home to him in the distorted reflection of himself that he sees in the minds of his friends, and God's cruelty seems all the more glaring that it has wounded him in his honour. Hence while in the complaint he only obscurely referred to God as the author of his trouble, he now attacks God without disguise.

vi. 2. Job begins with a reference to the criticism of his impatience (v. 2; cf. iv. 5). He wishes that it could be weighed against his pain; it would not then appear excessive.

together: i.e. with my impatience, though the meaning might be 'in its totality,' i. e. all my calamity.

3. Cf. Prov. xxvii. 3: 'A stone is heavy, and the sand weighty; But a fool's vexation is heavier than them both.'

rash, or 'wild'; cf. verse 26. The admission relates rather to the form of the language than to its substance. His fevered

For the arrows of the Almighty are within me, 4
The poison whereof my spirit drinketh up:
The terrors of God do set themselves in array against me.
Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass? 5
Or loweth the ox over his fodder?
Can that which hath no savour be eaten without salt? 6
Or is there any taste in the white of an egg?

---

utterances are due to the poison with which the Almighty has tipped His arrows (verse 4).

4. At last Job names God as the author of his troubles. It is because the pains he suffers are sent by the hand of the Almighty that they terrify and paralyse him. His spirit has drunk in the poison, which has sapped his inner strength. Changing the metaphor, he represents the terrors of God as assailing him like a hostile army. But the text may be wrong. Several scholars, including Dillmann, Budde, and Duhm, transpose two consonants, and read, 'the terrors of God do trouble me.' Duhm attaches to this verse the first line of verse 7, correcting 'to touch *them*,' with the LXX, into 'to be quiet,' the alteration required in the Hebrew being quite slight. See further on verse 7.

5. If the wild ass or ox have their desires satisfied, they do not complain; neither would Job complain, were there no adequate cause. His friends should infer from his complaints the depth of his suffering. So Amos argues that phenomena must have an adequate cause, and that the very fact of his appearance as a prophet should convince his hearers that Yahweh is about to bring some judgement to pass (Amos iii. 3-8).

fodder: the word means 'mixed fodder,' which was specially liked by the cattle.

6. We may translate the first line as in R. V., or we may translate, 'Can that be eaten which is tasteless and without salt?' The meaning of the second line is disputed. The phrase translated 'the white of an egg' means literally the slime about the yolk. The objection that the Jews learnt poultry-keeping from the Persians is not conclusive against this, though the phrase itself is curious. Some think a plant is intended, and that we should translate 'the juice of purslain' (see marg.) or 'purslain broth.' Klostermann says that the LXX read 'in dream words,' and he adopts this, taking the meaning to be that the friends should not interpret Job's fevered words as if they expressed his fundamental convictions. The change in the Hebrew is trifling, and Kamphausen, who judges Klostermann's emendations very unfavourably as a rule, thinks that this one deserves consideration.

7 My soul refuseth to touch *them*;
They are as loathsome meat to me.
8 Oh that I might have my request;
And that God would grant *me* the thing that I long for!
9 Even that it would please God to crush me;
That he would let loose his hand, and cut me off!
10 Then should I yet have comfort;
Yea, I would exult in pain that spareth not:
For I have not denied the words of the Holy One.

---

7. The margin translates the verse, 'What things my soul refused to touch, these are as my loathsome meat.' If the Hebrew text is correct, this does not seem to be an improvement. The second line is, however, very strange, literally it means 'they are as the sickness of my food,' i. e. apparently, they are like diseased food to me, the reference being to his sufferings, cf. iii. 24. Bickell strikes out the whole verse. Duhm, however, makes a very clever suggestion. As already mentioned, he transfers the first line to the end of verse 4, getting the couplet, 'The terrors of God do trouble me, my soul refuses to be quiet.' The second line then has no parallel, and he thinks it originated out of an Aramaic gloss on the last words of verse 6, meaning 'that is now called white of egg.' Ley alters a single consonant and obtains the sense, 'they make me loathe my food.'

8, 9. As Job dwells on the thought that his sufferings only too fully justify his complaint, the sense of all his long pain breaks on him with such overwhelming power that he vehemently cries for God to smite him so that He should not need to strike again. His deepest longing (as in ch. iii) is that God would put him out of his misery. Hitherto God has struck him with a fettered hand, so to speak; now he would have God release His hand and strike with full force, so that he should not linger in torture but be slain outright.

10. Job's comfort is death, and could he but be assured of its coming, he would not let the most ruthless pain quell his exultation at the prospect. If in the third line we translated 'that,' as in the margin, instead of 'for,' the second line would be parenthetical, and the meaning of the main sentence would be that Job's comfort would consist in the consciousness that he had not disowned the words of the Holy One. But this thought is alien to the context; it is therefore better to translate 'for.' The sense is in that case that he exults in the prospect of death, because he has not 'denied the words of the Holy One.' Inas-

What is my strength, that I should wait? 11
And what is mine end, that I should be patient?
Is my strength the strength of stones? 12
Or is my flesh of brass?
Is it not that I have no help in me, 13
And that effectual working is driven quite from me?
To him that is ready to faint kindness *should be shewed* 14
from his friend;

---

much, however, as this has little meaning, except on the assumption of retribution after death, to which Job does not look forward, since in Sheol good and bad were all in the same case, we should perhaps strike out the third line with Siegfried, Beer, and Duhm. Job's obedience to the commands of God was just what made his problem so perplexing, and death in conscious innocence was nevertheless death with his character uncleared, no cause for exultation. If the third line is omitted 'comfort' refers to death, and exultation to the prospect of it.

The margin offers several alternative translations, which must be enumerated, though in each case the text is to be preferred. For 'Yea, I would exult' it reads 'though I shrink back' or 'harden myself'; for 'that spareth not' it reads 'though he spare not'; and for 'denied' it reads 'concealed.'

11, 12. Were he strong like stones or brass he might bear pain with fortitude and patience, but he is so frail that he cannot repress his cry under torture. If his suffering led to renewed health he might endure it in patience, but since it can lead only to death, how can he be other than impatient when death comes so tardily to release him?

be patient: this is the sense of the Hebrew, which is literally 'prolong my soul'; the translation in A. V., 'prolong my life,' would require in Hebrew 'prolong my days.'

13. The Hebrew for **Is it not** is difficult; if the text is right, the meaning is that his strength is exhausted. Duhm divides the consonants differently and gets the sense, Behold, my help within me is nothing, i. e. my inward strength is nothing. Klostermann transposes two consonants and changes the pronominal suffix from first to third person, and obtains the sense 'should I believe my help is in him, seeing that all effectual working is driven from me?'

effectual working: see note on v. 12.

14. The verse is difficult, the general sense is probably that given by the R. V., though it would be better to substitute

Even to him that forsaketh the fear of the Almighty.
15 My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook,
As the channel of brooks that pass away;
16 Which are black by reason of the ice,
And wherein the snow hideth itself:
17 What time they wax warm, they vanish:
When it is hot, they are consumed out of their place.
18 The caravans *that travel* by the way of them turn aside;

'despairing' for 'ready to faint.' The verse expresses Job's keen disappointment with his friends; he knew himself to be slipping from true religion, and hoped that his friends would by their sympathy have strengthened his failing piety. The translation in the margin 'Else might he forsake' would require different Hebrew. The alternative 'but he forsaketh' gives no satisfactory sense. Some correct the text and read, 'He that withholdeth kindness from his neighbour forsaketh the fear of the Almighty.' Duhm reads, 'He who withholdeth kindness from the despairing forsaketh the fear of the Almighty,' and thinks it was originally a note on the two following verses, since it is too general and cold for Job's speech.

15. In a beautiful metaphor, somewhat elaborately worked out, Job describes how bitterly his friends have disappointed him. Cf. Jer. xv. 18, 'Wilt thou indeed be unto me as a deceitful *brook*, as waters that fail?' See Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 488. By 'brethren' he means the friends, not, as Fried. Delitzsch thinks, his actual brothers.

pass away: this is more fully developed in verses 17 ff. But we may also translate 'overflow,' and this yields a finer sense, and is further supported by the connexion with verse 16. The brooks overflow in winter time when they are not needed, but fail in the heat of summer; so Job's friends are full of kindness when none is needed, but when trouble comes they fail the sufferer.

16. When the thaw comes the streams rush down their channels, black with broken ice and melting snow.

17. wax warm: the word occurs only here, and its sense is doubtful. The margin translates 'shrink,' but the text is more probably correct. When they are scorched by the heat of summer they vanish.

caravans. This word also means **paths**, and if that sense is adopted here, we should translate as in the margin, 'the paths of their way are turned aside.' The meaning of the verse in that case is that the streams turn aside from their course and vanish in

They go up into the waste, and perish.
The caravans of Tema looked, 19
The companies of Sheba waited for them.
They were ashamed because they had hoped; 20
They came thither, and were confounded.
For now ye are nothing; 21
Ye see a terror, and are afraid.
Did I say, Give unto me? 22
Or, Offer a present for me of your substance?
Or, Deliver me from the adversary's hand? 23

---

the desert. But this is very unlikely. The same word is used in the next verse in the sense of 'caravans,' it is therefore improbable that it should mean anything else here. The streams vanish because of the heat, not because they leave their channels and meander to extinction in the sand, though it is true enough that streams do disappear in this way. Accordingly the verse means that when the caravans strike the channel, where they expected water, and find it dry, they turn aside to seek for water and perish miserably of thirst. Naturally they turn aside only because it is their last desperate chance; they will die if they stay where they are, and the next stream is too far for them to reach.

19. Tema is a North Arabian tribe of Ishmaelite origin. For **Sheba** see note on i. 15. Their caravans 'looked' for water, 'waited for them,' i. e. for the streams.

20. ashamed, as often, disappointed.

21. There is a variation in the MSS. between *lō'* 'not' and *lō* 'to it.' The former is translated in the R. V. text, but the sense 'nothing' can hardly be defended. The margin reads the latter, but the translation 'are *like* thereto' forces a meaning out of the Hebrew, and the thought would have been otherwise expressed. It is simplest to read *lī* 'to me' and to change 'for' into 'so' (reading *kēn* for *ki*), 'so have ye been to me.' Duhm follows Bickell in striking out the verse. He argues that while the friends were untrue they were not afraid. Still, Job may have seen in their attitude a proof of servility to God, whom they regarded as the author of his calamities.

22. Had he presumed on their friendship to ask a gift that would cost them anything, he would not have been surprised at their treatment, such a test he hints bitterly friendship could hardly be expected to stand.

23. Job had not asked them to spend any of their substance to

Or, Redeem me from the hand of the oppressors?
24 Teach me, and I will hold my peace:
And cause me to understand wherein I have erred.
25 How forcible are words of uprightness!
But what doth your arguing reprove?
26 Do ye imagine to reprove words?
Seeing that the speeches of one that is desperate are as wind.
27 Yea, ye would cast *lots* upon the fatherless,
And make merchandise of your friend.

---

redeem him from bandits by paying his ransom. Is it not possible that verse 27, which sounds extravagant, and is not closely connected with its context, may have originally stood after verse 23? Then the exaggeration would be natural. Did I ask you to ransom me from captivity? ransom me! you would much sooner sell me into it.

24, 25. Job is quite willing to be taught, and made to see his faults, but he cannot feel that Eliphaz has said anything to the purpose.

forcible: this translation may be right, but is conjectural. The radical sense of the word is sharpness, and this rather suggests the rendering, 'how irritating are words of uprightness,' a brilliant touch of nature as all will feel who have suffered from the conscientious ministrations of a 'candid friend.' If this is the meaning we must, of course, substitute 'and' for 'but' in the second line. A very similar word would give the sense 'how sweet,' and possibly the word in the text may simply be a harder form, and bear this meaning. Several adopt this view.

your arguing. The Hebrew is more scornful, 'reproving from you.'

26. Job seems to mean that his friends have made too much of his words; they ought rather to have penetrated behind the expressions that have outraged them to the feelings that prompted, and taken into account the circumstances that excused them. They ought to understand that the words of the desperate go into the wind (marg. 'for the wind'); they are too wild to warrant such censure as his words have received. Job is not fundamentally irreligious, as he would have been if he had spoken deliberately and in cold blood. The second line might mean that they treated his words as mere wind.

27. This is not very suitable in its context, and the charge is itself rather strange. It has been suggested in the note on verse

Now therefore be pleased to look upon me; 28
For surely I shall not lie to your face.
Return, I pray you, let there be no injustice; 29
Yea, return again, my cause is righteous.
Is there injustice on my tongue? 30
Cannot my taste discern mischievous things?
Is there not a warfare to man upon earth? 7
And are not his days like the days of an hireling?

---

23 that it would be more natural if it followed that verse. The word for 'lots' is not expressed; Bickell, followed by Duhm, reads 'fall' instead of 'cast' (literally 'cause to fall'), and for 'fatherless' he reads 'blameless.' 'Ye fall upon the blameless.' The second line has then to be read or at least explained otherwise than it is in R. V.

28. He entreats his friends to look him straight in the face, since he would certainly not be able to meet their glance with a lie on his lips. The margin translates 'and it will be evident unto you if I lie.' The text is better.

29. Some think that, stung by Job's invectives, the friends were leaving him, and that he begs them to return. But the meaning may be, turn from your misjudgement. This suits better the concluding portions of the two lines. He pleads that they would abandon their unjust treatment of him, and urges that his cause is just, for such seems to be the meaning of the Hebrew 'my righteousness is in it.'

30. The first line does not mean, is there wrong in my speech? but has my tongue lost the true taste of things, cannot it discriminate between good and bad? The second line has probably the same meaning.

vii. **1.** It is very striking with what skill the poet relates the general to the special problem in Job's mind. Hitherto he has been absorbed in the sense of his own misery, but now there dawns the consciousness that his own case is not singular. With new insight he looks at the broad field of human life, and reads its wretchedness through his own. Yet he barely glances at it, he is still so self-centred that he immediately returns to his own lot, the most poignant example of man's cruel destiny.

warfare. The word means either 'hard service,' military or otherwise, or, as the margin translates, 'time of service.' The word probably includes here both senses, the hard drudgery, the wounds and exposure of a soldier's life, and the impossibility of release till the full time, for which he has been engaged, has

2 As a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow,
And as an hireling that looketh for his wages:
3 So am I made to possess months of vanity,
And wearisome nights are appointed to me.
4 When I lie down, I say,
When shall I arise? but the night is long;
And I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of the day.

---

expired. Both thoughts are also present in the reference to the 'hireling,' who is probably a hired labourer, not a mercenary soldier.

2, 3. Job now returns to his own case. The verse is completed in verse 3, and is not the completion of verse 1. As the slave bearing the burden and heat of the day pants for the shades of evening, when the heat dies into the coolness and rest soothes his aching limbs, or as the hired labourer looks forward to the wages that mark the end of his toil for the day (cf. Matt. xx. 8), and to both the evening seems so long in coming, so Job, panting for the grave, feels bitterly how wearisome are the months whose dreary length he must traverse ere he attains his release.

earnestly desireth. The word means 'to pant for,' and it would have been better so translated.

wearisome nights: at first sight a curious parallel to **months,** but the point in 'months' is the duration, in 'nights' the intensity, of his suffering. Out of the months he selects the nights as the extreme example, just as Paul couples Scythians with Barbarians (Col. iii. 11). He thus effects the transition to verse 4.

4. Job's 'evening' is death, meanwhile, unlike the labourer, he has no rest day or night. As he lies down at night his thought is 'would God it were morning' (Deut. xxviii. 67). But the interminable night lies between him and the day, and is spent in unceasing tossing, his sleeplessness interrupted, as we learn from verse 14, only by terrifying dreams. The point of the reference to the night is not that the pains are more acute then than in the day-time. The full meaning can be understood only by those who have suffered through a night from violent pain; time literally seems to stand still. The translation in the margin 'When shall I arise and the night be gone?' obscures the full meaning. The poet must have suffered so himself, and known with how much greater slowness time seems to move through a night than through a day of pain.

My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; 5
My skin closeth up and breaketh out afresh.
My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle, 6
And are spent without hope.
Oh remember that my life is wind: 7
Mine eye shall no more see good.
The eye of him that seeth me shall behold me no more: 8

5. His sores breed worms, form a hard crust, and then break and run. In the second line the margin gives 'is broken and become loathsome,' but the text is better.

6. This is the most usual translation, but Elzas and Marshall have revived an older view that there is no reference to a shuttle that moves swiftly, but rather to the yarn or web which is so flimsy that the threads snap easily. In that case the word translated 'hope' must mean 'thread' as in Josh. ii. 18. Marshall renders the second line, 'They come to an end for lack of thread.' Elzas quotes Shaw as saying with reference to the women in his time, 'they do not use the shuttle, but conduct every thread of the woof with their fingers.' Cheyne corrects the text and reads 'my days are swifter than a crane,' and similarly in the parallel passage ix. 25, 26 he introduces birds instead of 'post' and 'swift ships' to correspond with eagle. But it is no gain to secure uniformity by eliminating the variety of metaphor. If the translation in the text be retained, 'without hope' means without hope of recovery; there is no reference to a happy future after death. There is no radical inconsistency in the complaint that life passes swiftly and the complaint that it drags on interminably. It is simply a change in point of view. A swift death is preferable to life in agony, but if life could be passed without constant pain, its brevity is an evil, since none would willingly exchange its warm glow and thrilling interest for the cold and colourless monotony of Sheol.

7, 8 are addressed to God, not to Eliphaz; the plural is generally used when Job is addressing the friends, since one speaks for all. The pathos of this pitiful appeal to God, just before the bitter reproaches he is about to fling at Him, is very fine and moving. It is like an echo of the old familiar relations between them. Verse 8 is omitted in the original LXX, and therefore by Bickell. It is also regarded with suspicion by Dillmann, Budde, and Beer, while Duhm thinks there is no reason for rejecting it. There is some repetition in it, but the most serious objection is that it anticipates, and thus weakens the force of the very beautiful and touching verse with which the speech closes.

remember: so in x. 9. For life as wind cf. Ps. lxxviii. 39.

Thine eyes shall be upon me, but I shall not be.
9 As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,
So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more.
10 He shall return no more to his house,
Neither shall his place know him any more.
11 Therefore I will not refrain my mouth;
I will speak in the anguish of my spirit;
I will complain in the bitterness of my soul.
12 Am I a sea, or a sea-monster,

---

upon me: not 'against me.' God will seek as of old to look on him in love, but he will have passed to Sheol, in which God's loving-kindness is not displayed, and whose inhabitants cannot praise Him (Ps. lxxxviii. 10–12, vi. 5; Isa. xxxviii. 18).

9, 10. Job here emphatically denies the possibility of a return to earth after death. It is important to observe his attitude to this question, and how subtly the poet by the very energy of Job's denial shows the fascination the thought had for him, and suggests to the reader a recoil from his hopeless outlook (cf. x. 21, 22, xiv. 7–22, xvi. 22). The Babylonians called the underworld 'the land of no return.' As an illustration of the thought Lucretius, Book III, ll. 907–9, may be compared. Mr. Mallock paraphrases the lines thus:

> 'Never shalt thou behold thy dear ones more,
> Never thy wife await thee at the door,
> Never again thy little climbing boy
> A father's kindness in thine eyes explore.'
>
> *Lucretius On Life and Death*, p. 26.

11. Stirred by this sad picture of his troubles Job will no longer restrain himself. In his former speech, while his complaining is very bitter, he says but little against God, and that little indirectly. But now, with the utmost directness, he charges God with being his tormentor, in language of incisive bitterness, not untouched with scorn. He has to die soon and in agony, but he will at least tell God plainly what he thinks of Him, while the cherished opportunity still remains to him. He comes perilously near to fulfilling the Satan's prediction that he would curse God to His face. He hopes nothing from Him, soon he will have no more to fear from Him; he will have the relief of utter frankness, bursting the restraint he had so long placed on his speech.

12. In savage irony Job asks if he is so dangerous that God must keep a strict watch over him. Is he the turbulent sea,

That thou settest a watch over me?
When I say, My bed shall comfort me, 13
My couch shall ease my complaint;
Then thou scarest me with dreams, 14
And terrifiest me through visions:
So that my soul chooseth strangling, 15
And death rather than *these* my bones.
I loathe *my life*; I would not live alway: 16

---

fretting against the limits imposed on it by God, lest it should flood the earth or smite heaven with its angry waves? Is he the 'sea monster,' the dragon Tiamat, subdued by the Creator in the hoary past, but still kept in close confinement, lest once more it challenged with Him the rule of the universe? A frail, puny, mortal, already death-stricken, how could he be such a menace to God that He must watch him so narrowly?

13–15. When he seeks rest, hoping that his complainings may cease for a little, then God sends him a sleep that is worse than waking. Avicenna says: 'During sleep frequent atrabilious dreams appear. Breathing becomes so difficult that asthma sets in, and the highest degree of hoarseness is reached. It is often necessary to open the jugular vein, if the hoarseness and the dread of suffocation increases.' Lacking our modern conception of secondary causes, Job sees in these sufferings not the natural accompaniment of his disease, but direct acts of God.

15. So great is his agony that he wishes he might be suffocated outright. There is no reference in the verse to any contemplation of suicide, and though we might translate the second line 'death from my bones,' this cannot be explained to mean death by my own hands. If the Hebrew text is right we must translate as in R. V., and explain, I choose death in preference to being the skeleton I am. This interpretation, however, is rather forced, and it would be better, with several scholars, to change one consonant and read 'death rather than my pains.' Some also connect the first word of verse 16 (translated 'I loathe *my life*') with this verse, translating 'I despise death in comparison with my pains.' It is true that it does not make very good sense in verse 16, but it is questionable whether the language will permit it to be transferred to verse 15.

16. I loathe *my life.* The rendering 'I loathe' is to be preferred to the margin 'I waste away,' and the object of loathing is probably correctly defined as 'my life,' though standing by itself the expression is rather strange. Similarly, 'I would not live alway'

Let me alone ; for my days are vanity.
17 What is man, that thou shouldest magnify him,
And that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him,
18 And that thou shouldest visit him every morning,
And try him every moment?
19 How long wilt thou not look away from me,
Nor let me alone till I swallow down my spittle?

---

is clearly better than the margin 'I shall not live alway,' as that was too obvious.

Let me alone: Job calls 'Hands off!' to God, a bold command.

vanity: marg. 'as a breath,' cf. verse 7.

17. In this and the following verse we have a bitter parody of Ps. viii. 5. The Psalmist, impressed with the wonders of the starry heavens, asks what is man that God should be so mindful of him and place him in a position of such high authority. Job asks, not why God should lavish on a creature so insignificant such honour and thoughtful care, but why he should be subjected to attention so alert and suspicious, as if he could really be of any importance. Job's morbid imagination distorts the unsleeping care of God into a maddening espionage. Disdain of His creatures would have been more befitting than such spiteful vigilance. How petty His character must be, since He descends to torture one so frail, and harry him with persecution so untiring. Had he known the truth he might have argued, 'How loving is the God who cares so minutely for man, and how great man must be, since he is worthy of God's unceasing regard.'

18. visit him: Cheyne needlessly emends the text, and reads 'prove him.' This, it is true, gives a closer parallel to the second line, and if the parody on Ps. viii. 5 disappeared with this word, would deserve more consideration. But the opening words of verse 17, and the general drift of the two verses, would, apart from this word, suggest Ps. viii. 5, and if it was in the poet's mind we should expect him to use 'visit.' If 'prove' was the original text, it might just as well be argued that the present text was due to an intentional conformation to the Psalm as that it was due to accident. But, if so, the poet is surely more likely than an editor to have seen this, and to have written 'visit' himself. Duhm thinks that Ps. viii is later than Job, in which case there is, of course, no parody.

19. Job feels that God has so beset him behind and before that he cannot escape from Him. To other souls than his the sense that they can never be free from God's observation, or live their

If I have sinned, what do I unto thee, O thou watcher of 20
men?
Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee,
So that I am a burden to myself?
And why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and 21
take away mine iniquity?
For now shall I lie down in the dust;
And thou shalt seek me diligently, but I shall not be.

---

own life away from Him, has proved very oppressive. The reader will remember how prisoners have been exposed to incessant observation till the consciousness of it has driven them mad. This illustrates Job's case, his conviction of God's malevolence has sharpened his sensitiveness to His watchfulness. Cf. xiv. 6, Ps. xxxix. 13 (R.V. marg.). The expression in the second line is common in Arabic; one would be glad to think the poet wrote something different, but that is no justification for altering the text.

20. Job does not admit that he has sinned, but he urges that, if he had done so, his sin could not hurt God, who was far beyond reach of any shafts that men might shoot at Him. We may contrast 'Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned.' In the phrase 'watcher of men' Job reiterates the thought that God is a spy on his every movement. The margin 'preserver' gives the wrong sense.

a mark: not a target, though elsewhere Job applies this metaphor to himself (vi. 4, xvi. 12, cf. Lam. iii. 12, 13), but something against which one strikes. Job is, so to speak, always in God's way, wherever he may be; however anxiously he seeks to avoid contact with Him, God is always striking against him.

a burden to myself: so the present Hebrew text. But Jewish tradition says that the original reading was 'a burden on Thee,' and that this is one of the eighteen corrections of the scribes. Many scholars (though not Dillmann and Budde) accept 'on Thee' as original. Since we can more easily explain why 'on Thee' should be altered to 'on me,' this alteration being dictated by reverence, than why the Jewish tradition should have arisen if 'on me' was original, the tradition is probably correct. The thought is one of amazing boldness, that Job is a burden on the Almighty! but not too bold for the poet.

21. If he is a sinner, why should not God forgive him? Has God no magnanimity, that thus He treasures up Job's sins, till he has paid Him the uttermost farthing of penalty? Why not forgive before forgiveness is too late? For soon—thus with matchless

8 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said,
2 How long wilt thou speak these things?
And *how long* shall the words of thy mouth be *like* a mighty wind?
3 Doth God pervert judgement?
Or doth the Almighty pervert justice?

---

pathos Job brings his speech to an end—he will die; but God will not remain in His present mood; He will think on His devoted servant once more in love, filled with remorse for His fit of anger, He will long to renew the old communion. But His vain regrets will come too late, Job will be gone beyond recall. It is strange how wonderfully the poet depicts the rising of this double conception of God in Job's mind. God as he feels Him to be in the present has not driven out God as he knew Him to be in the past. This thought of God's higher and lower self is prominent in some of Job's subsequent utterances.

viii. 1–7. Bildad rebukes Job's stormy, empty utterance. Impossible that the Almighty should be unjust! If Job's children have perished through their sin, yet if Job is righteous and will appeal to God, He will restore him to greater prosperity than before.

viii. 8–19. Let Job inquire of the ancients, who really knew, and were not ignorant as men now are, and they will teach him how short-lived is the prosperity of the wicked, and how certain is his doom.

viii. 20–22. God will not cast away the perfect or uphold the wicked. Job shall be restored and his enemies come to nought.

The theme of Bildad's speech is that God cannot do wrong, He rewards the good and the evil according to their works. It is Job's denial of this that has shocked him most deeply; he passes by his accusations of faithlessness and his complaints of his suffering that he may bring Job to a truer judgement of God. His tone is milder than that of Eliphaz, and much milder than that of Zophar. Job does not answer him with scorn or reproaches in his reply to this speech. Too modest to venture anything on his own authority, and with no awe-inspiring revelations to relate, Bildad rests on the maxims of the ancients.

viii. **2. a mighty wind.** The emphasis lies on the stormy character of Job's speech, uprooting cherished beliefs; there may be a further suggestion, that it was mere windy empty rhetoric.

3. The stress is placed in the Hebrew on **God** and **the Almighty**. How incredible that God should be unrighteous!

If thy children have sinned against him,
And he have delivered them into the hand of their transgression: 4
If thou wouldest seek diligently unto God,
And make thy supplication to the Almighty; 5
If thou wert pure and upright; 6
Surely now he would awake for thee,
And make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous.
And though thy beginning was small, 7
Yet thy latter end should greatly increase.
For inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, 8
And apply thyself to that which their fathers have searched out:

Bildad cannot think together the notions God and injustice; they are mutually exclusive. And they are so, if God be truly defined. But the friends were in danger of identifying omnipotence with righteousness. It is Job's merit that he disentangles the two qualities.

4, 5. Usually verse 4 is taken as complete in itself, as in the margin, 'If thy children sinned against him, he delivered them into the hand of their transgression.' This is probably better than the translation in the text. The reference to the death of Job's children favours the view that the poet wrote the Prologue, or at least incorporated it in his book. Job has not died by the swift summary vengeance that destroyed his children, yet he must have sinned, for the Almighty can do no wrong, so let him turn in penitence to God, lest the same fate overwhelm him. Cf. v. 8.

6. If Job repents and becomes pure, then God will restore prosperity to his now righteous habitation. Instead of 'awake for thee' the LXX reads 'answer thy prayer,' which better befits Bildad's scrupulous reverence.

7. This is one of the cases where the poet puts an unconscious prediction into the mouth of one of the speakers, which is later fulfilled.

8, 9. It is not quite clear on what principle Bildad considers the wisdom of the ancients to be superior. It may be that they lived much longer lives, and therefore could ponder the mysteries of life more deeply. Yet the speakers themselves are represented as belonging to the patriarchal age. Eliphaz is much older than Job's father, if in xv. 10 he refers to himself, and Job was not young at

9 (For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing,
Because our days upon earth are a shadow:)
10 Shall not they teach thee, and tell thee,
And utter words out of their heart?
11 Can the rush grow up without mire?
Can the flag grow without water?
12 Whilst it is yet in its greenness, *and* not cut down,
It withereth before any *other* herb.

---

the time. So Job's own life is a long one, since he lives a hundred and forty years after his restoration. On the other hand, this might seem short in comparison with the great ages of the earlier patriarchs, and Jacob counts his one hundred and thirty years few and evil, when set beside the life of his forefathers (Gen. xlvii. 9). Dillmann thinks the thought is rather that a single generation is too short to understand these things, we need to rest on the collective wisdom of mankind, as it has been slowly gathered through its generations. But in that case surely it is the heirs of all the ages who are 'the true ancients,' and each generation adds its own quota to the stock, the former age being less wise than the most recent. There may be the thought in his mind that the ancients stood nearer to the fount of wisdom, the stream becoming through successive ages more corrupt.

11. With this verse begin the wise sayings of the ancients. The Egyptian imagery suggests that Bildad regarded the Egyptians as possessors of the most ancient wisdom. It also affords evidence of the poet's acquaintance with Egypt.

rush: rather, as in marg. 'papyrus.' It will grow without mire, but it will not grow to its proper height. 'Grow up' means 'grow high.'

flag: marg. 'reed-grass.' It is an Egyptian word (*aḥu*) found only here and Gen. xli. 2, 18. It means Nile grass.

12. If water be taken away from its roots, even though it be in the lusty vigour of its greenness, not yet ripe and on the edge of decay, it will wither sooner than any herb.

13. The wicked, as the Psalmist says, may spread himself like a green tree in its native soil, yet he suddenly vanishes away. Similarly Eliphaz, v. 3. Instead of 'paths' we should probably read a similar word, transposing two consonants and slightly correcting another, translating 'such is the end' (*aḥărīth* for *orḥōth*). Duhm thinks that this verse with verse 20 formed a four-lined stanza. But since it is impossible to interpolate verse 20 between verses 13 and 14, he cuts out verses 14-19 as a later

So are the paths of all that forget God ; 13
And the hope of the godless man shall perish :
Whose confidence shall break in sunder, 14
And whose trust is a spider's web.
He shall lean upon his house, but it shall not stand : 15
He shall hold fast thereby, but it shall not endure.
He is green before the sun, 16
And his shoots go forth over his garden.
His roots are wrapped about the heap, 17
He beholdeth the place of stones.

---

interpolation. This is a heavy price to pay, and it makes Bildad's speech very short, for this stage of the debate at any rate.

14. break in sunder: marg. 'be cut off.' The word might also come from a root meaning 'to loathe,' though this is unlikely. The parallelism requires a noun rather than a verb, corresponding to 'spider's web' in the second line. If we could accept the view that the word in the text is a noun meaning 'gossamer' this would give a most satisfactory parallel. Unfortunately this rests on inadequate evidence. Beer, followed by Duhm, emends the text and reads 'spider's threads.' Marshall follows Reiske in giving the sense 'gourd,' making a new metaphor begin here and continue to the end of verse 18. 'It is no longer a marsh-rush suddenly dried up at the root. It is a fine climbing-plant, growing over a ricketty house, which it crushes by its weight.' The sense is good, but the meaning 'gourd' is insufficiently supported.

web. The Hebrew word means 'house,' and it would have been better to translate it so, and thus make plain the connexion with verse 15.

15. Budde deletes this verse as a gloss on verse 14, but not on cogent grounds.

16. The godless man is now compared with a plant, thriving and firmly rooted, but destroyed and its memory disowned by the very soil on which it had flourished.

17. This verse is difficult. The word translated 'heap' may also mean 'fountain' as in Cant. iv. 12, and some take it so here, translating, as in the margin, 'beside the spring.' The meaning of the second line is very uncertain. The translation in the text gives the sense which the words would usually bear, though 'house' should be substituted for 'place,' but in this context it is quite pointless. Several scholars assume another verb with the same consonants meaning 'to pierce.' In that case we may suppose that the word translated 'place' really means 'between,'

18 If he be destroyed from his place,
Then it shall deny him, *saying*, I have not seen thee.
19 Behold, this is the joy of his way,
And out of the earth shall others spring.
20 Behold, God will not cast away a perfect man,
Neither will he uphold the evil-doers.
21 He will yet fill thy mouth with laughter,
And thy lips with shouting.
22 They that hate thee shall be clothed with shame;
And the tent of the wicked shall be no more.

9 Then Job answered and said,

---

as in the present text of Prov. viii. 2, Ezek. xli. 9. If so it is an Aramaism, but since the text in Prov. viii. 2 is uncertain, it would be simpler to correct the last consonant, reading *bēn* for *bēth*, and thus get the usual word for 'between.' We should thus obtain the excellent sense 'It pierces between stones,' retaining 'heap' in the first line. The sense 'pierce,' however, is very uncertain. Accordingly we should perhaps, with Siegfried and Duhm, follow the LXX, and altering one consonant read 'lives.' Siegfried translates, 'It keeps alive between stones.' Duhm's translation seems better: 'Its roots are twined about the spring, It lives in a house of stones,' i.e. the small building erected above the spring.

18. At last its life is cut short by irretrievable destruction, and no vestige of it is left. Its place disowns it, just as the sea is said in Isa. xxiii. 4 to disown its children.

19. Several think 'the joy of his way' is unsuitable, but no very satisfactory emendation has been proposed. If correct it is ironical.

earth, marg. 'dust.' From the ground which had given him birth others spring; he is forgotten and others fill his place.

20. Bildad closes his speech by affirming his conviction that God cannot reject the blameless or support the wicked, and by applying it to Job's case. **Perfect** has reference, in the author's mind, to the descriptions of Job in the Prologue.

21. The margin 'till he fill' gives the sense of the Hebrew as pointed. It is unsuitable, and it is better to point differently and translate as in the text: 'He will yet fill.'

ix. 1–4. Job replies to Bildad: True, man cannot be in the right against God, who, since He is all-wise and all-powerful, can entangle man into self-condemnation and put him in the wrong.

Of a truth I know that it is so : 2
But how can man be just with God?

---

ix. 5–13. God controls all the forces of Nature, mountains and ocean, sun and stars, by His inscrutable power. None can hinder His elusive, all-powerful working.

ix. 14–21. How then can Job confront Him? rather he would cast himself on His compassion. Were he to cite Him and He appeared, yet He would not listen, for He overwhelms him with His persecution, and would force him, though blameless, to condemn himself. Hence, while his lips are free, he will assert his blamelessness, reckless of what may come upon him.

ix. 22–24. Blameless and wicked God destroys alike, mocking at the despair of the innocent. Injustice reigns throughout the earth, and it is God who is directly responsible for this.

ix. 25–35. Job now describes his fleeting, wretched life, and God's fixed determination to make him guilty, in spite of all he may do to establish his innocence. He cannot meet God on equal terms, and there is no umpire to enforce his decision upon them. Let God cease to afflict him, and not paralyse him with His terror, then he would speak fearlessly, knowing that in himself he had no need to fear.

x. 1–22. Weary of life Job pours out his complaint. Why should God persecute him, His own handiwork, and innocent? is this worthy of God? Let God think with what loving care He fashioned him, whom now He is bringing to dust. Nay, the love was mere seeming, all along God had meant to destroy him. Innocent or guilty it is all the same, God assails him with His miracles. Why then was he born? Let God give him a brief respite, ere he passes for ever to Sheol's utter gloom.

ix. **2.** Job accepts the general principle that God will treat the righteous according to his righteousness. But that is irrelevant to the real issue, which turns on the question, What constitutes righteousness? To be righteous means no more than to be in the right, and what is to prevent the Almighty from declaring the wicked to be in the right, or the innocent to be in the wrong? He sets the standard of righteousness, and if He is Himself immoral, the blameless may be branded as guilty, and against omnipotence can get no redress; there is no higher court of appeal. How then can man be 'righteous' before God if He is determined to put him in the wrong? Job here touches on the problem whether a thing is right because God declares it to be so, or whether He declares it right because it is so. He sees

3 If he be pleased to contend with him,
He cannot answer him one of a thousand.
4 *He is* wise in heart, and mighty in strength:
Who hath hardened himself against him, and prospered?
5 Which removeth the mountains, and they know it not,
When he overturneth them in his anger.

---

clearly that there is no necessity in the nature of things that omnipotence should be righteous. The friends had not disentangled the two conceptions, see note on viii. 3. Job is not endorsing Eliphaz's assertion that man must seem unclean to the infinite purity of God. Far from it this purity seems very dubious to him.

3. The margin is better, 'If one should desire to contend with him, he could not,' &c., since we thus have the same subject in both verses. If man wished to enter on a contest with God, he would be hopelessly worsted, for he could not answer one in a thousand of His subtle questions. It is very interesting that when God speaks out of the storm His speeches are composed almost entirely of questions to which Job can give no answer. The translation in the text seems to mean, If God be pleased to contend with man, he could not answer one in a thousand of God's questions. We might translate, He will not answer, i. e. God would not reply to one in a thousand of man's questions. This finds some support in verse 16, but is not probable.

4. heart is often used in the Bible when we should use intellect. It would be hopeless for man to pit himself against the wise and mighty God, whom none can withstand with impunity. There may be a reference to the case of Pharaoh in the second line, cf. also Prov. xxix. 1.

5. This description of the elemental convulsion in which the mountains are overturned reads curiously. What is the point of saying that the mountains do not know that God overturns them? Would they know it, whoever overturned them? It is explained that they are overturned suddenly, but we should have expected this to be differently expressed. The Syriac, followed by Bickell, Beer, and Duhm, reads 'he knows' instead of 'they know.' This gives the sense that God uproots mountains without knowing it; to His omnipotence it is so slight a matter that He does it unconsciously. This is probably the original reading. for so daring an anthropomorphism would seem too objectionable to be left unaltered. It is not at all too daring for the poet.

Which shaketh the earth out of her place, 6
And the pillars thereof tremble.
Which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; 7
And sealeth up the stars.
Which alone stretcheth out the heavens, 8
And treadeth upon the waves of the sea.
Which maketh the Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades, 9

6. The earth was supposed to rest on pillars, which are probably to be identified with the roots of the mountains, just as their summits were the pillars on which the firmament rested. The verse is a poetical description of an earthquake.

7. The command to the sun not to shine may refer to eclipses or to storms. The sealing up of the stars expresses the thought that they are kept in their abode and sealed up there. Apparently they are regarded as dwelling in a certain part of the heavens, whence they are brought forth at night to shine in the firmament. Whether they appear or not depends on the will of God, who summons each by name, and by His great power compels them to come forth, so that none of those He calls is lacking (Isa. xl. 26), or seals up the door of their abode so that they cannot break out into the sky.

8. God is so strong that He stretches out the heavens by His own unaided power, cf. Isa. xl. 12, 22, xliv. 24, xlv. 12. We might also translate 'bends,' but this is less likely.

waves of the sea: Heb. 'high places of the sea.' Some think it is the heavenly ocean, 'the waters above the firmament,' that is intended. This is quite possible, since the rest of verses 7–9 is concerned with the skies. In themselves the words suggest rather the earthly ocean. A storm is described in which the waves rise like mountains and God walks on their crest. This verse and the following should be compared with two of the creation passages in Amos, viz. iv. 13, v. 8.

9. Cf. xxxviii. 31–33; Amos v. 8. The translation 'Orion' is generally accepted. The word seems to mean 'fool,' and the reference to his 'bonds' in xxxviii. 31 suggests a mythological allusion to a giant bound in the sky, probably in connexion with some Titanic revolt against God. The translation 'the Bear' is accepted by many, though several think it means the Pleiades, or, as Stern suggests, Alcyone, the most brilliant star of that constellation, the other stars of the group being her children (translated in xxxviii. 32 'her train'). It does not occur in Amos v. 8, and it may have come in here through dittography of the first two letters of the word translated 'which maketh.' It is irregularly

And the chambers of the south.
10 Which doeth great things past finding out;
Yea, marvellous things without number.
11 Lo, he goeth by me, and I see him not:
He passeth on also, but I perceive him not.
12 Behold, he seizeth *the prey*, who can hinder him?
Who will say unto him, What doest thou?
13 God will not withdraw his anger;
The helpers of Rahab do stoop under him.

---

spelt, and we should have expected 'and' before 'Orion.' The translation 'Pleiades' is also that most generally accepted; we should perhaps identify, however, with Canis Major, in which the bright star Sirius is situated. In that case the 'chain' (see R. V. marg. xxxviii. 31) is the chain by which the 'Great Dog' is held by Orion, at whose feet he lies.

the chambers of the south: this vague term can hardly apply, as many suppose, to a constellation. Davidson says they 'are probably the great spaces and deep recesses of the southern hemisphere of the heavens, with the constellations which they contain.' It would be possible, however, to identify them with the storehouses of elemental forces, such as the storm, or light and darkness; cf. xxxvii. 9, xxxviii. 22.

10. Quoted from the speech of Eliphaz v. 9; but with a very different object. For Eliphaz bases upon it his counsel that Job should supplicate God, and illustrates it by reference to God's beneficence in nature and the equity of His moral government. Job insists on God's greatness, because he feels how much more hopeless it makes the case of one who contends with Him. His greatness is uncontrolled by goodness, and His power directed without compunction to immoral ends.

Beer, Duhm, and Fried. Delitzsch strike out verses 8–10 as an insertion, but on inadequate grounds.

11. Not only is God mighty, but His working is invisible, terrible because it is so elusive. He is an unseen enemy; His victim cannot guess where He will strike, he cannot prepare for the blow or parry it, but must await it in the agony of suspense.

12. hinder him: marg. 'turn him back.'

13. God: placed in an emphatic position in the Hebrew. Other powers may do so freely or by compulsion, but God lets His wrath wreak itself on its object to the bitter end. As an illustration, Job quotes the case of 'the helpers of Rahab.' The margin gives 'arrogancy' for 'Rahab,' but this is clearly inadequate, for

How much less shall I answer him, 14
And choose out my words *to reason* with him?
Whom, though I were righteous, yet would I not answer; 15
I would make supplication to mine adversary.
If I had called, and he had answered me; 16
Yet would I not believe that he hearkened unto my voice.
For he breaketh me with a tempest, 17
And multiplieth my wounds without cause.
He will not suffer me to take my breath, 18

---

it is some definite event (translate with marg. 'did stoop') that is in the poet's mind, not a mere moral maxim. In Isa. xxx. 7, to which the margin refers, Egypt is called Rahab, so apparently Ps. lxxxvii. 4. Other passages which have been supposed to allude to Egypt are probably to be otherwise interpreted. The reference to Egypt is quite unsuitable here. Rahab is parallel to 'the dragon' in Isa. li. 9, and to 'the sea' in xxvi. 12. It is a name for Tiamat, already referred to more than once in the book. Her 'helpers' are her brood of monsters, who assisted her in the primaeval conflict with heaven. Even those mighty powers were crushed by the omnipotence of God.

14. How ill then Job would come off from a contest with Him, and quailing before the terror of His majesty, how incapable he would be of choosing the fit words in which to argue his case!

15. Job, even though innocent, would be unable to confront God and answer Him; he would rather be compelled to cast himself on the mercy of his adversary. The marg. 'to him that would judge me' does not bring out so well the force of the Hebrew.

16. If the text is correct the meaning is that if Job called God to judgement, and He answered the summons, he would refuse to believe that God would really listen to him. Duhm follows the LXX in inserting a negative, 'If I called, He would not answer me, I cannot believe that He would hearken to my voice.'

17, 18. The reason why Job thinks so gloomily of his prospects in a legal conflict with God. This lies in the treatment he is receiving at God's hands, which only too clearly displays God's temper towards him. Some think the verses describe how God would deal with him, if He were to appear in answer to Job's summons. So far from listening, He would assail him with extreme violence.

breaketh: the same word as that translated in Gen. iii. 15 'bruise.' The meaning is disputed, both there and here (see Bennett's note). Some take it 'to make at.'

But filleth me with bitterness.
19 If *we speak* of the strength of the mighty, lo, *he is there*!
And if of judgement, who will appoint me a time?
20 Though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me:
Though I be perfect, it shall prove me perverse.
21 I am perfect; I regard not myself;
I despise my life.
22 It is all one; therefore I say,

---

filleth me with bitterness: cf. Lam. iii. 15.

19. It is not quite clear whether we should translate as in text. or as in marg. 'Lo, *here am I, saith he.*' If we retain the former, we should probably, with Duhm and Klostermann, read 'appoint him' in the second line. We should read the first person in both lines or the third in both. The marg. 'If *we speak* of strength, lo, *he is* mighty' is very unlikely.

20. The appearance of God would so overpower Job that, though blameless, he would confess himself guilty. It is not certain whether in the second line we should translate **it,** or, as in the marg., 'he'; the former is perhaps more probable.

21. Under the strong impression that when put to the awful test he might shrink before the terror of God, and confess under torture what in his inmost heart he knew to be a lie, he seizes the present opportunity to assert his innocence, 'Blameless I am.' He speaks in impassioned recoil from the terrible possibility, to which he feels he may be driven, that he may renounce the honour that is more to him than life. For he feels that to punish this outspoken declaration God may kill him out of hand, but he does not regard himself, in other words, he does not value his life enough to save it by silence.

I regard not myself: Heb. 'I know not myself.' The meaning is not that he is a riddle to himself, but that he holds his life of no account.

I despise my life. The two words, thus translated, are short for a line. Some omit them, but the first line thus loses its parallel. Duhm makes the line of normal length, by adding the next two words translated 'It is all one.' He then omits 'therefore I say.' As the next line is then left without a parallel he secures it by adding the last line of verse 24, where we have three lines. We should thus get the couplet 'He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked, If not he, then who is it?' This is one of those rearrangements that ought to be right.

22. it is all one. Job seems to mean 'it is all one and the same whether I live or die,' or possibly 'it is a matter of indifference

He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked.
If the scourge slay suddenly, 23
He will mock at the trial of the innocent.
The earth is given into the hand of the wicked: 24
He covereth the faces of the judges thereof;
If *it be* not *he*, who then is it?
Now my days are swifter than a post: 25
They flee away, they see no good.
They are passed away as the swift ships: 26

---

whether I speak or am silent.' The interpretation 'it is all one with the righteous and the wicked' is generally rejected on the ground that Job is just about to say this. In the second line he is emphatic, 'perfect and wicked HE destroys,' but God is left unnamed. Here Job explicitly denies that there is a moral order of the universe. Granted that God slays the wicked, this does not prove a sufferer to be guilty. For he slays with no moral discrimination good and bad alike. Thus Job contradicts Bildad's assertions in viii. 20.

23. The 'scourge' is one wielded by God, even though we do not read with the Syriac 'his scourge.' Job means great sudden calamities, like pestilence, which do not select their victims on moral principles. The innocent die as well as the wicked, and God mocks at their despair.

24. Injustice reigns over the whole earth, a condition of things due directly to God, who perverts the very organs of justice to make them instruments of tyranny. It is not unlikely that the circumstances of the author's time shape his expression. The words gain a fuller significance if the Jews were groaning at the time under bitter oppression from a world-empire. The second line seems to mean that God blinds the judges so that they cannot see what is right or wrong.

25. From this general indictment of God's government of the world Job returns to his own case. He complains that his life runs so swiftly to its end without his seeing good. Apparently he refers to the brief rest he might have expected before death came, though he may mean that in his life he has seen no good, his present pain blotting out the memory of former happiness.

post, or a 'runner' He means a swift messenger, chosen for his work on account of his fleetness.

26. swift ships. The margin says 'Heb. *ships of reed*.' This is the view generally taken, the word translated 'reed,' which does not occur elsewhere, being connected with a similar Arabic

As the eagle that swoopeth on the prey.
27 If I say, I will forget my complaint,
I will put off my *sad* countenance, and be of good cheer:
28 I am afraid of all my sorrows,
I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent.
29 I shall be condemned;
Why then do I labour in vain?
30 If I wash myself with snow water,
And make my hands never so clean;
31 Yet wilt thou plunge me in the ditch,
And mine own clothes shall abhor me.

---

word meaning 'reed.' They are the papyrus boats with wooden keels, used on the Nile, manned by one or two, and very swift owing to their extreme lightness.

27. be of good cheer, *lit.* 'brighten up.'

28. His resolve to leave off complaining and be cheerful is but momentary, for he knows that the paroxysm of pain will return. God will not hold him innocent, and will therefore continue to smite him.

29. The first line would be better translated 'I have to be guilty.' Why should he toil to establish his innocence, when whether innocent or not God was determined to make him out to be guilty. Duhm strikes out the verse as a prosaic gloss.

30. with snow water. Another reading is 'with snow.' The difference in the Hebrew is very slight. The latter is better, since snow water is not itself clean, and has no exceptional cleansing virtue. The latter objection might seem to lie against 'with snow,' accordingly some read, with a minute change in the Hebrew, 'like snow'; we might then compare 'whiter than snow' in Ps. li. 7 or 'if your sins be as scarlet, shall they be as white as snow?' in Isa. i. 18. This is not necessary, since the perfect whiteness of snow may have seemed to confer on it especial power of purifying. And it is unlikely, for in the second line mention is made of the instrument of purification ('with alkali'), and it disturbs the parallelism if we read 'like' instead of 'with' here.

make my hands never so clean, *lit.* 'cleanse my hands with lye,' i. e. alkali.

31. Lagarde, followed by Duhm, thinks the expression 'my clothes shall abhor me' too strange to be right, and suggests 'my friends,' with a comparatively slight alteration in the text. But

For he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, 32
That we should come together in judgement.
There is no daysman betwixt us, 33
That might lay his hand upon us both.
Let him take his rod away from me, 34
And let not his terror make me afraid:
Then would I speak, and not fear him; 35
For I am not so in myself.

---

the text gives a striking metaphor. Though Job washes himself with snow and cleanses his hands with alkali, Yahweh plunges him in the ditch, and thus makes him so foul that his clothes loathe to cover him. Job does not mean that however pure he may be in his own eyes he must seem vile to the infinite purity of God. He does not admit that God is justified in so regarding him. The meaning is rather that while he is really innocent God is bent on making him seem guilty, a loathsome spectacle of moral foulness. Fried. Delitzsch interprets strangely.

32. Quailing at the thought of the irresponsible might of God, Job utters the bitter cry that God and he cannot meet as man to man on equal terms. How then is he to secure a fair trial of his case?

33. The LXX, followed by several scholars, though not by Dillmann and Duhm, read the word translated 'not' with a different vowel, 'would that there were an umpire.' The duty of the 'daysman' or 'umpire' (marg.) would be to lay his hand upon both disputants, in other words, to make them submit to him and enforce his decision upon them. If God were only a man, or failing that if there were a third party who could represent one to the other, at present so estranged, so mutually unintelligible, who could enter with sympathy into the standpoint of each, then there might be a chance of even-handed justice, and a decision which both parties to the suit would be forced to accept. The human heart yearns for a human God. The Christian answer is not at all in the poet's mind, but the need to which it responds was his deepest craving.

34. Cf. xiii. 21, where Job makes a similar request. While God is smiting him with His pains, and terrifying him with His majesty, he is in no state to plead his cause. Let God not weight the dice against him, cease to distract him with agony, and, when He appears, not overpower him with awful dread, then collected and undismayed he would present his plea. Elihu takes up Job's word, and says that he at any rate fulfils the conditions (xxxiii. 7).

35. I am not so in myself: a vague expression. 'So' seems to

10 My soul is weary of my life;
I will give free course to my complaint;
I will speak in the bitterness of my soul.
2 I will say unto God, Do not condemn me;
Shew me wherefore thou contendest with me.
3 Is it good unto thee that thou shouldest oppress,
That thou shouldest despise the work of thine hands,
And shine upon the counsel of the wicked?
4 Hast thou eyes of flesh,
Or seest thou as man seeth?
5 Are thy days as the days of man,

---

refer to 'and not fear him,' and the meaning is that while he might be terrified by the circumstances, he had in himself no cause to fear, since his conscience was free from guilt.

x. **1.** Once again Job longs for death, and since life is so wretched, resolves, as in vii. 2, to speak out all the bitterness of his complaint, reckless though it may bring him a still sharper punishment. The complaint, however, is for the most part remonstrance or pathetic appeal.

my complaint, *lit.* 'my complaint with me.' The expression is strange, perhaps we should read, with a slight emendation, 'my complaint against Him.'

The third line is put together from vii. 11. Bickell and Duhm strike it out, and one line has to be eliminated if the scheme of four-lined stanzas must be maintained at all costs, unless we suppose that a line has fallen out after the first line, and divide the stanzas differently.

3. Is it good unto thee. It is not clear whether this means, 'does it please thee?' or 'does it befit thee?' or 'is it profitable to thee?'

despise the work (Heb. *labour*) **of thine hands.** Contempt for God's handiwork reflects contempt on God.

The last line is struck out by Bickell, followed by Beer and Duhm, and even by Budde. The thought is somewhat alien to the context, and the line seems to limit 'the work of thy hands' to the good as opposed to the wicked, whereas it more naturally means man as the creature of God, without reference to moral character.

4. Is God's persecution due to His inability to see more clearly than a mere man?

5. The meaning is generally supposed to be, Is God so short-lived that He must lose no time in punishing Job, lest He should

Or thy years as man's days,
That thou inquirest after mine iniquity, . 6
And searchest after my sin,
Although thou knowest that I am not wicked; 7
And there is none that can deliver out of thine hand?
Thine hands have framed me and fashioned me 8
Together round about; yet thou dost destroy me.
Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast fashioned me 9
as clay;

---

die and His victim thus escape Him? Some think the verse explains verse 4: God is not short-sighted, for He is eternal, and has therefore had eternal experience, and thus gained perfect wisdom.

6. God seeks to discover Job's guilt by the sufferings He inflicts; He uses torture to make him confess.

7. The present text gives an excellent sense, God knows Job to be innocent, yet He seeks to drive him to confession of guilt; He knows that no one can deliver Job from His power, yet He overwhelms him with suffering as if at any moment he might slip through His fingers. The verse does not present the usual parallelism. The text of the second line has been emended by Beer and Duhm to secure a parallel to the first line. The emendation of the latter is preferable, since it is nearer the present text, 'and there is no treachery in my hand.'

8. Job begins to urge upon God the wonderful care He had lavished on him, to drive home the strangeness of His action in now destroying him. Instead of the somewhat curious 'together round about' the LXX reads 'and afterwards changing.' This is now generally accepted, because in addition to the peculiar character of the present text it involves taking part of the second line with the first, so that the division of the lines does not coincide with that required by the sense. It is not quite certain how the Hebrew should be restored, the sense would be something like 'afterwards thou turnest to destroy me.'

9. Barth, followed by Dillmann, takes the second line as well as the first to be governed by **remember,** 'I am formed of clay and must return to dust.' But there is no reference here to the common lot of mortals, for Job's meaning is that God is wantonly destroying His own handiwork, not that extinction must ultimately overtake him in the course of nature. He is not complaining that he must die, but that he must die before his time and so painfully. We must adopt the usual view that in the first line Job recalls the care God has taken in fashioning him, and in

And wilt thou bring me into dust again?
10 Hast thou not poured me out as milk,
And curdled me like cheese?
11 Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh,
And knit me together with bones and sinews.
12 Thou hast granted me life and favour,
And thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.
13 Yet these things thou didst hide in thine heart;
I know that this *is* with thee:
14 If I sin, then thou markest me,

---

the second line his surprise that He should reduce to dust that on which He has spent such pains.

Remember: God must be suffering from a strange lapse of memory, or He would remember what skill and labour He had lavished on that which He is now bent on destroying.

10, 11. These verses describe the process of his formation.

12. The first line seems to refer to his birth, the second to the subsequent preservation of his life. The Hebrew in the first line is a little strained, we should perhaps for 'life and favour' read 'grace and favour' with Beer, or 'life and length of days' with Duhm.

13. All this care had only masked God's sinister design, which He had cherished from the first, thus to overwhelm him with calamity. He wished to beguile Job into a happy confidence in His love, to eradicate all fear of misfortune, that the blow might fall on him with all the more crushing, paralysing force.

I know. Contrast xix. 25.

14. God's fell purpose, long entertained, is now exhibited in more detail from this verse to verse 17; we should translate 'If I sinned, then thou wouldst mark me, and thou wouldst not acquit me,' and similarly throughout the passage. It is possible to translate as in the text, in which case Job is describing God's present dealings with him rather than describing how God had treasured up His dark designs.

If I sin, as contrasted with 'If I be wicked' (verse 15), refers to slight as opposed to grave sins. Whatever he did, God had made up His mind to hold him guilty. If he should commit some trifling fault, if he should be guilty of some grave wickedness, even if he were innocent, he would be condemned just the same. It is questionable if we ought to establish any sharp distinction between 'thou wouldst mark me,' 'woe unto me,' and 'I must not lift up my head.' They are all rhetorical varia-

And thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity.
If I be wicked, woe unto me; 15
And if I be righteous, yet shall I not lift up my head;
Being filled with ignominy
And looking upon mine affliction.
And if *my head* exalt itself, thou huntest me as a lion: 16
And again thou shewest thyself marvellous upon me.
Thou renewest thy witnesses against me, 17
And increasest thine indignation upon me;
Changes and warfare are with me.

---

tions for the same idea. Job surely does not mean that God would punish him more severely for a heavy than for a light offence. His point is that God had determined how he would treat him, and would not be moved by any considerations of Job's conduct. The immorality of God would hardly tally with such carefully graduated adjustment of penalty to offence.

15. The marg. 'I am filled with ignominy, but look thou upon mine afflictions; [verse 16] for it increaseth: thou huntest me as a lion' should be rejected; if the Hebrew text is right we must translate as in R. V. But 'looking upon mine affliction' is very flat and prosaic. A very slight alteration in the Hebrew gives 'drunken with affliction,' which is much more effective and forms an excellent parallel to the preceding words. We may translate, 'sated with shame, and drunken with sorrow.' The LXX simply reads 'I am sated with shame.' Beer and Duhm strike out the words, but it would be a pity to lose them. God's purpose was that even if Job were innocent, He should so overwhelm him with shame and sorrow that he could not lift up his head.

16. The first line is difficult, and some scholars omit it. The verb has no subject expressed; probably we should supply 'my head' as in R. V. Nor is it clear whether God or Job is compared to a lion; cf. Hos. v. 14, xiii. 7, 8; Lam. iii. 10. In the second line the bitter irony is heightened by the previous description of God's wonderful creation of him. He worthily matches the miracle of creating by the pains He now inflicts. God's present miracles are the tortures of a helpless creature by omnipotence.

17. Generally the last line is taken as a hendiadys: 'Changes and a host are with me,' that is, successive hosts assail him; so the margin, 'Host after host is against me.' But we should perhaps follow the LXX and Syriac, and read 'thou renewest a host against me.' The hosts God keeps sending are His pains.

18 Wherefore then hast thou brought me forth out of the
womb?
I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me.
19 I should have been as though I had not been;
I should have been carried from the womb to the grave.
20 Are not my days few? cease then,
And let me alone, that I may take comfort a little,
21 Before I go whence I shall not return,
Even to the land of darkness and of the shadow of death;
22 A land of thick darkness, as darkness *itself*;
A land of the shadow of death, without any order,
And where the light is as darkness.

18, 19. Why should God have been so pitilessly set on His purpose as to bring Job to the birth? Could He not have relented so far as to suffer him never to have been born?

20. But since God has not spared him the tragedy of life, let Him listen to Job's touching appeal for the slender boon he now craves. Must his life be intolerable anguish, passing into Sheol's dismal gloom, with no brief respite of untroubled peace? Let God remember how short a span of life is left to him, how dreary the interminable darkness that awaits him, and grant him at least that this interval may be free from pain!

The Hebrew as written gives the sense translated in the R. V. marg. 'let him cease and leave me alone.' The reader is directed, however, to substitute different consonants, and the sense is then that given in the text, which is the more probable. We should perhaps read with the LXX, slightly altering the Hebrew, 'Are not the days of my life few? let me alone, that I may brighten up (see ix. 27) a little.'

21. Whence I shall not return. Cf. vii. 9, 10, xiv. 7-22.

land of darkness: yet Sheol, dreary as is its unutterable gloom, he feels, in some of his moods at any rate, to be better than life. There at least he will not be tortured.

22. Several scholars suspect this verse of being a later insertion. Its heaping together of various synonyms for darkness is strange. It would be better to abbreviate it than to cut it out, and we may omit three words in the Hebrew as due to mistaken repetition, translating 'A land of thick darkness, without any order, And where the light is as darkness.' This is just the place where Job may well paint Sheol in dark colours.

The reader cannot fail to be struck with the poet's skill in

Then answered Zophar the Naamathite, and said, 11
Should not the multitude of words be answered? 2
And should a man full of talk be justified?

---

depicting the tumult in Job's soul. He oscillates between the sense of God's ruthless injustice to him now and the memory of blessed fellowship with Him in the past. His pain is real, therefore God is his enemy; but the fellowship in the past was also real, was not God then his friend? He feels himself driven to the terrible conclusion that from the first God had nursed against him an implacable hate, and the better to gratify it had through long years set Himself to win Job's confidence that his calamity might not lack the uttermost bitterness, the sense that he had trusted and been betrayed. Yet even after he has expressed this conviction he closes with an appeal to God, an indication that the old temper of soul towards Him had not been killed out. Much of the interest of this drama of the soul lies in the growth of a consciousness in Job that God's present anger does not represent His inmost self. It is a mood that will pass, a dark cloud eclipsing His truest character. This thought does not, however, emerge as yet.

xi. 1-6. Zophar rebukes Job for his fluent babbling against God, who would soon convince him what depths of wisdom lay in His action.

xi. 7-12. The wisdom of God is unsearchable, none can restrain Him from working His will. He knows iniquity and His chastening leads to the sinner's reformation.

xi. 13-20. If Job will renounce iniquity a life of blessedness will be his portion, but the wicked shall be driven into desperate straits.

Zophar is a rougher type of man than the more dignified Eliphaz or the gentler Bildad. He is a vigorous and effective speaker, and for intellectual power ranks with Eliphaz and compares favourably with Bildad. But he is the most rasping disputant of the three. In Job's lengthy speech he can see nothing but long-winded babblings, the accusations hurled against God and Job's strong assertions of his innocence blinding him to its pathos and passionate appeal.

2. The length of Job's second speech irritated the impatient Zophar. He sees in Job a fluent rhetorician, the torrent of whose eloquence must not be suffered to sweep all before it.

a man full of talk, *lit.* 'a man of lips.' Job is a sophist, without genuine conviction or solid argument.

3 Should thy boastings make men hold their peace?
And when thou mockest, shall no man make thee ashamed?
4 For thou sayest, My doctrine is pure,
And I am clean in thine eyes.
5 But Oh that God would speak,
And open his lips against thee;
6 And that he would shew thee the secrets of wisdom,
That it is manifold in effectual working!

---

3. Perhaps we ought to read 'should men be silent at thy babblings?' Job's mockery is not the sarcasms he has flung at the friends, but the blasphemies he has uttered against God.

4. The verse might be taken as a question, but if not, Zophar is summarizing the general drift of Job's speech, rather than quoting his actual words. According to the present text Job is said to make two statements, that the views he has enunciated are sound, and that he is innocent in God's sight. It is not easy to believe that the second line explains the first, My doctrine is pure that God afflicts those whom He knows to be righteous, for I was righteous in His sight, yet He has afflicted me. One cannot but feel that the two statements are somewhat unequally yoked together. Beer reads 'my walk' instead of 'my doctrine,' with a slight change in the Hebrew, though the sense is disputed. This yields a good parallelism, and is probably correct. For 'in thine eyes' the LXX reads 'in his eyes,' which is not an improvement, for it misses the point that Job says this outright to God's face. Siegfried reads 'in my eyes,' but though an accusation of self-righteousness, as if Job were the final court of appeal, is not inappropriate, the present text is better. What profoundly shocks Zophar is not Job's self-righteousness, but his assertion of God's unrighteousness. He is pure in *God's* eyes, yet God treats him as a sinner. The text also secures a much better connexion with verses 5, 6.

5. Job had said that God knew him to be innocent. But if God responded, as Zophar devoutly wishes He would, to Job's challenge to meet him, He would soon show him that so far from smiting him with unmerited punishment, He was really chastising him more lightly than he had deserved.

That it is manifold in effectual working, marg. 'For sound wisdom is manifold.' The word translated 'effectual working' is that translated 'enterprise' in v. 12 (see note). The word translated 'manifold' may also mean 'twofold.' But 'twofold'

Know therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine
iniquity deserveth.
Canst thou by searching find out God? 7
Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?

---

of what? Obviously not, as some have taken it, of Job's wisdom, for Zophar could hardly be guilty of the absurdity of assuring Job that God was twice as wise as he was, especially after Job had himself asserted God's wisdom in such strong language. 'Double what you think it is' would be less inadequate, but the words hardly mean this. We may therefore set aside the translation 'double,' and accept that in the text. But several scholars now make a trifling alteration in the Hebrew and for 'manifold' read 'like wonders,' or simply 'wonders.' Fried. Delitzsch interprets that two belong to true wisdom, i. e. man who claims to be right and God who admits the claim. It is hardly likely that this is the true explanation.

exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth: marg. 'remitteth (Heb. causeth to be forgotten) unto thee of thine iniquity.' The sense is probably 'brings a part of thy sins into forgetfulness for thee.' The suggestion that God is forgetful of a portion of Job's sin, does not remember it all against him, and therefore that his suffering is less than what he might justly have received, is not too rancorous for Zophar, the coarsest of the friends, though it is rather strong even for him at this stage of the debate. Nevertheless the LXX reading, 'that thy deserts have happened to thee from the Lord for thy sins,' while milder, is probably not to be preferred, and to omit the line with Bickell, who omits a good deal in verses 4–12, and Duhm is very unsatisfactory. We may contrast with this line the beautiful saying of the Second Isaiah, 'She hath received at Yahweh's hands double for all her sins' (Isa. xl. 2).

7. The translation of the first line is hardly defensible. The marg. 'Canst thou find out the deep things of God?' gives what is probably the true sense. The word translated 'deep things' probably means 'the object of search,' though the word may also mean 'the act of search' or 'the result of search.' If the act of search is intended, the meaning would be, can you discover the limits of God's investigation?

find out the Almighty unto perfection. For 'find out' another verb probably stood in the original text, not merely because the repetition is unlikely, but because the Hebrew is rather strange. The text would probably run originally something like 'Canst thou reach to the perfection of the Almighty?'

8 It is high as heaven; what canst thou do?
Deeper than Sheol; what canst thou know?
9 The measure thereof is longer than the earth,
And broader than the sea.
10 If he pass through, and shut up,
And call unto judgement, then who can hinder him?
11 For he knoweth vain men:
He seeth iniquity also, even though he consider it not.
12 But vain man is void of understanding,
Yea, man is born *as* a wild ass's colt.

---

8. In what follows the reference is probably to the Divine wisdom, not to the Divine nature.

It is high as heaven: literally, as in the marg., 'The heights of heaven.' If this is correct the words are an exclamation, 'Heights of heaven! what canst thou do?' But as we have in the next three lines **deeper than Sheol, . . . longer than the earth, . . . broader than the sea,** we should clearly read here, 'It is higher than the heavens.' Zophar takes the extreme examples of height and depth, of length and breadth in the physical universe to set forth the vastness, the comprehensiveness and infinite range of God's wisdom, against which Job pits himself in vain.

10. Zophar takes up Job's own words ix. 11, 12. We need not suppose, with Duhm, that the verse is a misplaced portion of Job's speech. 'Call unto judgement' is literally 'call an assembly.'

11. The wisdom of God finds a sphere of action in His moral government. He knows the wicked, without needing to consider it, i. e. He has intuitive knowledge, and therefore does not depend on observation. The question arises here, as in several other passages, whether for *lō'* 'not' we should read *lō* 'to it': 'He seeth iniquity also and payeth regard to it.' The margin 'and him that considereth not' is not so good.

12. This is a very difficult verse. The translation 'is void of understanding' is dubious, the word bears this privative meaning in another conjugation (*Piel*), but it is questionable whether the conjugation here used (*Niphal*), as the word is pointed, can mean this. It would be quite easy to get over this difficulty, but the sense is not satisfactory; it is mere tautology to say that a hollow man is without understanding. Accordingly we should take the verb to mean 'will get understanding.' But, even then, there are more ways than one of interpreting the verse. The marg. 'But an empty man will get understanding, when a wild ass's colt is born a man' yields a good sense in itself, the second line then express-

If thou set thine heart aright, 13
And stretch out thine hands toward him;
If iniquity be in thine hand, put it far away, 14
And let not unrighteousness dwell in thy tents;
Surely then shalt thou lift up thy face without spot; 15
Yea, thou shalt be stedfast, and shalt not fear:
For thou shalt forget thy misery; 16
Thou shalt remember it as waters that are passed away:
And *thy* life shall be clearer than the noonday; 17
Though there be darkness, it shall be as the morning.

---

ing the idea of 'never,' like our 'when pigs fly.' But it does not spring naturally out of the context, and cannot be well fitted into it. It would accordingly be better to translate, 'So an empty man gets understanding, And a wild ass's colt is born a man.' Thus we get a good connexion with what precedes, God chastens the wicked, and thus the empty man gains wisdom. The wild ass's colt is the type of that which is undisciplined and hard to tame. The second line is strangely expressed. If the text is right it is probably a popular proverb. Budde slightly alters the text and reads 'is tamed.' We could then translate, 'And a wild ass's colt of a man is tamed,' the phrase being copied from the description of Ishmael, Gen. xvi. 12. Or we might read, 'A wild ass's colt is tamed,' supposing that 'man' is a subsequent insertion under the influence of Gen. xvi. 12, or to make sense after 'tamed' had been corrupted into 'born.' Siegfried unnecessarily omits the verse.

13. Zophar, like Eliphaz, closes his speech with exhortation, and a promise of prosperity, but, as is to be expected in a man of his temper and at this more developed exhibition of Job's attitude, he more openly assumes Job's guilt, and in the general statement as to the fate of the wicked with which he ends, does not exclude Job from those to whom it may apply.

14. The text assumes that Job is guilty of sin. Bickell and Siegfried quite needlessly strike out the verse. Duhm may be right in reading 'If evil be not in thine hand, and wickedness dwell not in my tent.' Nevertheless, the assumption of guilt is not premature at this point in the debate.

15. Zophar is referring to Job's complaint in x. 15.

17. be clearer than: marg. 'arise above.' Cheyne thinks the Hebrew, which is strange, cannot be correct; he reads 'And the days of thy life shall be as the noonday.'

Though there be darkness: this is the best way of taking

18 And thou shalt be secure, because there is hope;
Yea, thou shalt search *about thee*, and shalt take thy rest
in safety.
19 Also thou shalt lie down, and none shall make thee afraid;
Yea, many shall make suit unto thee.
20 But the eyes of the wicked shall fail,
And they shall have no way to flee,
And their hope shall be the giving up of the ghost.

12 Then Job answered and said,

---

the words as pointed; the meaning is that the very darkness shall be light, a striking antithesis to Job's description of the gloom of Sheol that awaits him, where the light is as darkness. Possibly the words may mean though a period of darkness has still to be endured, it will soon break into radiant dawn. The word may be a noun. 'Darkness shall be as the morning.'

19. The court favourite has many flatterers; when Job is once more God's favourite he will not lack this testimony to his dignity. In his prosperity he had received deep respect even from princes and the aged (xxix. 7–10, 21–25). Now, as he bitterly complains, the lowest ranks of society and those younger than himself have him in derision (xxx. 1–10), the very children despise and mock at him (xix. 18).

20. Bildad's prediction of the fate of the wicked is here repeated, but whereas he identified the wicked with Job's enemies, Zophar leaves open the possibility that Job may himself be included in that category, and in the last line significantly alludes to Job's repeated wish that he might die.

xii. 1–6. Job ironically praises the wisdom of the friends, but he is not inferior to those who utter such trite commonplaces. His friends mock him in spite of his piety; how easy for those who are fortunate to despise the wretched! while the wicked prosper.

xii. 7–12. All creation testifies to God's almighty rule; we should not accept all the teaching we hear, even though given by the aged, but discriminate.

xii. 13–25. God is both wise and mighty, none can undo His deeds; He overthrows the highest and turns the wisest into fools.

xiii. 1–12. Well does Job know God's manner of government; he has nothing to learn from the friends, but desires to reason with God. The friends would show themselves wiser if they

were silent; they are flatterers of God because they dread Him, but their cringing flattery will draw down His anger. All their maxims are worthless.

xiii. 13–22. Let the friends be silent, for Job at whatever risk will speak his whole mind, and maintain his cause to God's face, confident of his innocence. But let God release him from pain and not appal him with His terror, then he will plead with Him as plaintiff or defendant.

xiii. 23–28. Let him know with what sins God charges him. Why does God hide His face in hostility? Why pursue with such rancour one so insignificant and so frail?

xiv. 1–6. Man's days are brief and full of trouble, why should God harass one whose life He has so rigidly limited? Let God release him from His watchfulness, that he may make the most of the time left to him.

xiv. 7–12. For the tree may bud again, though it be cut down and its roots decay; but man dies and his sleep knows no waking.

xiv. 13–17. Would that God might hide him in Sheol till His wrath were spent and then remember him! How gladly he would wait to renew at last the tender intercourse, when God would once more desire His servant, watch over him and forget his sin.

xiv. 18–22. But even mountains and rocks perish, and man is sent away by God into that state where he knows no longer how his dear ones fare on earth, but is conscious only of his own pain.

Hitherto Job had said but little in direct answer to the friends, though he had expressed his deep disappointment that they had failed him in his extremity (vi. 14–23), asserted the worthlessness of their arguments (vi. 24–26), and chidden their unkindness and blindness (vi. 27–30). It is with the conduct of God that he is most deeply engrossed. The thought of His immorality has a dreadful fascination for him, to that magnet the trembling needle constantly turns. Small need that the friends should talk to him of God; he knows it all, His wisdom, His might, His exaltation above His frail creatures. So with biting sarcasm he now assails them directly. Why do they vex him with such empty commonplaces? Is this their boasted wisdom? They are sycophants, who try to curry favour with God by smearing over His misgovernment with their lies. Yet even in this speech it is with God Himself rather than with the arguments of the friends that Job is concerned. His strength and wisdom he depicts more brilliantly than the friends, thus making good his assertion that he is not inferior to them. But as he describes its working he dwells more on its destructive than its beneficent operation. Yet it is

2 No doubt but ye are the people,

God's relations to himself that absorb his deepest interest. Scorning God's self-appointed champions, he would fain confront God Himself, and as he had done in his previous speech, names the terms on which he would be willing to meet Him. From this his thought passes to the brevity of man's days, and once more he wonders that God should condescend to cast His malevolent regard on one so insignificant. It is not as though this life were to be followed by another. For then man would not be so unworthy of God's attention, and a second life might redress the miseries of the first. But this life is all man has, if that is not happy he will have no chance of happiness elsewhere. He will go down to Sheol, his eternal home. To Sheol, yes, but might not God hide him in that inaccessible abode till His wrath had spent itself? Then He might think once more on His servant, and long for the work of His hands, He might renew the old happy fellowship. Vain hope! man's banishment to Sheol is irrevocable.

Some scholars have impugned, in whole or in part, the genuineness of ch. xii. Siegfried, after striking out verses 4–6, omits xii. 7—xiii. 1 as an interpolation, intended to harmonize the speeches of Job with the orthodox doctrine of retribution. There was, however, a real reason why Job should emphasize God's might and wisdom. The friends spoke as if these attributes involved the righteousness of God. But experience has convinced Job that the Power that governs the universe need not be, and in fact is not, righteous. The friends argued, God is all-powerful and all-wise, therefore He can do no wrong; Job replied, true, God is all-powerful and all-wise, but He is unrighteous none the less, and does all the more evil, that power and wisdom guide His unrighteousness to its baneful ends. Kuenen admits that the objections to ch. xii are not groundless. The sequence leaves something to be desired, and chs. xiii, xiv form a complete answer to Zophar. Still, many difficulties may be due to textual disorder, and the poet may have let Job say more than was necessary on the wisdom or power of God, so as to show that he did not fall behind the friends. The chapter may be justified as a parallel to ix. 4–12. He adds that it is very unlikely that a later interpolator who wished to bring out Job's superiority to the friends should have done it in this way.

xii. 2. **the people**: some explain this to mean 'the right kind of people,' but it is now more generally taken in the national or tribal sense. It would then be like our colloquial repartee, 'you're everybody!' Naturally, Job sarcastically continues, when they die, wisdom will die with them. It is not, however, a very probable expression, and Klostermann may be right in his very

And wisdom shall die with you.
But I have understanding as well as you ; 3
I am not inferior to you :
Yea, who knoweth not such things as these?
I am as one that is a laughing-stock to his neighbour, 4
A man that called upon God, and he answered him :
The just, the perfect man is a laughing-stock.
In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt 5
for misfortune ;
It is ready for them whose foot slippeth.

---

ingenious suggestion that *'am* is a relic of *hayyode'im*, the word being obliterated, with the exception of the two final consonants. If so the text ran originally, 'No doubt but ye are they that have knowledge ;' cf. xxxiv. 2.

3. Zophar has hinted that by God's chastisement the hollow man gets understanding. Job, applying this to his own case, retorts that he has already as much understanding as the friends ; indeed, every one knows the shallow commonplaces that constitute their speeches.

4. Siegfried, followed by Duhm, omits verses 4–6. The latter urges that this passage speaks of the godless who despise the pious, whereas Job is condemned by the godly for his supposed impiety. But Job speaks out of the consciousness of his own piety, and in his reference to the mockery to which he is exposed he does not mean that he was mocked on account of his godliness, which was not true in his case, but that in spite of it he was taunted with impiety. The meaning hardly seems to be that Job complains of the contempt displayed by the friends in that they offer him such elementary instruction. Ley thinks the second line is a description of the 'neighbour,' not of Job, and translates the third line 'a laughing-stock to the just, the perfect man.' In that case Job refers ironically to Zophar as one who called on God and was answered by Him, as a just and blameless man. Klostermann with a slight emendation gets the sense, for the second and third lines, 'Where has there ever been one who cried to God, and to whom the righteous answered with mockery?'

5. Not an easy verse, but if the text is sound the R. V. translation is to be adopted, except that we should perhaps take the word translated 'it is ready' as a noun meaning 'a blow.' Several emendations have been proposed, but they seem to be no improvement on the present text. Job means that it is very natural

6 The tents of robbers prosper,
And they that provoke God are secure;
Into whose hand God bringeth *abundantly*.
7 But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee;
And the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee:
8 Or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee;

---

for those who are in pleasant circumstances to despise the unfortunate; it is quite the world's way to hit the man who is down.

6. Although Job has simply said in verse 5 that the prosperous despise and buffet the wretched, the general maxim is coloured in his own mind by the thought of his own case, hence while he does not say that the wretched, who are thus scorned and mishandled, are righteous, the fact that it was so in his own case determines the form which the antithesis assumes in this verse. But Job not only contrasts the wicked with the unfortunate, but instead of dwelling as in verse 5 on the treatment they receive from men, asserts their unassailable position.

Siegfried, followed by Budde, reads 'Security of the tents belongs to the robbers and safety to those that provoke God.' The form of the verb translated 'prosper' is strange.

The third line is difficult. With the present text we should probably translate as in the margin, 'that bring their god in their hand.' The meaning would then seem to be that they worship their own power and make it their god, for which idea Hab. i. 11. 16 is generally compared. A simple emendation would be to transpose the preposition with Siegfried and Beer, and get the sense, Who lifteth his hand against God, but the construction is questionable. Duhm emends ingeniously and gets the sense 'to him that saith, Is not God in my hand?'

7. The wisdom which the friends have complacently been teaching Job is so rudimentary that the very animals possess it. It is not of any secret wisdom possessed by the animals that Job is speaking, such as is often ascribed to them in folk-lore, e. g. in the legends about Solomon. It is rather of a knowledge universally diffused, accessible to all God's creatures. The passage is to be treated as poetry, but antiquity did not draw the same sharp line between human and animal intelligence as we draw.

8. speak to the earth: Clearly we ought not to have the earth itself included in an enumeration of the various living creatures in the earth. We have beasts, birds, and fishes mentioned in the other clauses, accordingly we should have 'swarming things' in this line. Those who retain the present text take 'the earth' to mean or include 'all the forms of lower life with which

And the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee.
Who knoweth not in all these,
That the hand of the LORD hath wrought this?
In whose hand is the soul of every living thing,
And the breath of all mankind.
Doth not the ear try words,
Even as the palate tasteth its meat?

it teems' (Davidson). But this puts an undue strain on the language. Ewald read 'speak to the living creatures of the earth,' but 'speak to the swarming things' would be better, since the word translated 'earth' is much like that translated 'swarming things.' It is questionable, however, if this is quite satisfactory. The word translated 'speak' is also a noun meaning 'plant,' and though it is not likely that plants are here included among animals, the alternative rendering is also open to objection. An imperative in the first clause of this couplet corresponds, it is true, to the imperative in the first clause of the preceding couplet. On the other hand, as in the line before and the line after we have 'the air' and 'the sea' mentioned, the question arises whether we should not retain 'the earth' and correct the word translated 'speak.' The best emendation is probably Hitzig's, 'or the swarming things of the earth.' Duhm's emendation 'or the crawling things of the earth' is perhaps transcriptionally easier, but the word is rare, occurring twice only in the O. T. and therefore not likely to occur here, since the three corresponding terms are the familiar ones. Dillmann's suggestion that the line may not be genuine can hardly be correct, for the parallelism requires it.

9. Cf. Isa. xli. 20. The margin 'by all these' may be right, the meaning will then be 'who does not know by means of all these creatures?' Or the meaning may be 'which among all these creatures does not know?' The mention of Yahweh, which is carefully avoided by the poet in the speeches (xxviii. 28 belongs to an insertion), is surprising. Some MSS. read Eloah, i. e. God, which may be original, or a correction to conform the verse to the poet's usage. If the poet wrote Yahweh it must have been by an oversight. The meaning of **wrought this** is not quite clear; certainly it does not mean 'has made this universe,' probably the sense is, has done as Zophar represented Him as doing; the lowest creatures all know that God is as strong and wise as you say.

11. Davidson thinks that this verse indicates that the ear as well as the eye (verses 7–10) is a channel of sound information.

12 With aged men is wisdom,
And in length of days understanding.
13 With him is wisdom and might;
He hath counsel and understanding.
14 Behold, he breaketh down, and it cannot be built again;
He shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening.
15 Behold, he withholdeth the waters, and they dry up;
Again, he sendeth them out, and they overturn the earth.
16 With him is strength and effectual working;
The deceived and the deceiver are his.

But it is the friends, rather than Job, who appealed to the wisdom of the ancients. Job lays stress rather on the judgement which the listener passes on what he hears than on the information he gets by listening. The point is, therefore, one should not believe all he hears, but test it and discriminate between false and true, as the palate distinguishes between nauseous and pleasant food. Job asserts his right to take up an independent attitude to the doctrines forced on him by the friends, and to their reliance on tradition.

12. If the previous verse has been correctly explained, this verse cannot contain a statement of what Job believes. He may be summarizing the view of the friends, as the margin takes it, 'With aged men, *ye say*, is wisdom,' or it may be a question expecting the answer 'No.' Duhm reads, 'Are years wisdom?' Some regard the verse as a later addition or as possibly misplaced.

13. In emphatic contrast to the view that wisdom belonged to the ancients, Job asserts that it is God who possesses wisdom, and might as well. The insertion of a single letter in the word translated 'counsel' would yield a word meaning 'strength,' and thus we should gain a complete parallelism with the preceding line (so Budde). Duhm regards the verse as a variant of verse 16, but the contrast between verses 12 and 13 is effective, and if 13 is eliminated the transition from 12 to 14 is rather abrupt.

14. Job now describes the working of God, in which His might and wisdom are displayed. He begins with God's destruction of cities, and then passes to His imprisonment of men in dungeons from which there is no escape. Probably some definite historical events are in the poet's mind.

15. He causes both drought and deluge. Cf. Amos v. 8, ix. 6.

16. effectual working: marg. 'sound wisdom'; see note on v. 12.

The deceived and the deceiver are his: apparently he means that God is responsible for both.

He leadeth counsellors away spoiled, 17
And judges maketh he fools.
He looseth the bond of kings, 18
And bindeth their loins with a girdle.
He leadeth priests away spoiled, 19
And overthroweth the mighty.
He removeth the speech of the trusty, 20
And taketh away the understanding of the elders.
He poureth contempt upon princes, 21
And looseth the belt of the strong.
He discovereth deep things out of darkness, 22
And bringeth out to light the shadow of death.

---

17. The first line bears a suspicious resemblance to the first line of verse 19, and the parallelism with the second line is anything but close. Duhm removes both difficulties by reading 'counsellors of the earth he makes foolish'; the measures taken to secure the result are rather drastic, but something of the kind is more suitable than the present text.

18. The first line apparently means that God loosens the bond imposed by kings. The word as pointed means 'correction,' a different pointing gives us the meaning 'bond,' though elsewhere the word occurs only in the plural. Not only does God free the king's prisoners, but He binds the kings themselves. Since to bind the loins with a girdle means to strengthen, we should probably read a slightly different word instead of 'girdle,' meaning 'bond' or 'fetter.'

19. priests: a very important order in Israel, still more so in some other nations, e.g. Egypt.

spoiled: the word may mean 'barefoot.'

21. For the first line see Ps. cvii. 40.

the strong. The word elsewhere means 'canals,' but this gives no suitable sense here. It is questionable if the word means 'strong,' that, however, is the sense required, and it can be obtained by a slight emendation. Cheyne reads 'greaves' instead of 'belt.'

xii. 22-25. Dillmann questions if all of this is original. Duhm suspects verse 22 on account of its abstract character; some reject verse 23. Budde strikes out verses 22, 24, 25.

22. The meaning is not clear. The **deep things** may be the secret plans of men, or the secret decrees of God, or the depths

23 He increaseth the nations, and destroyeth them:
He spreadeth the nations abroad, and bringeth them in.
24 He taketh away the heart of the chiefs of the people of the earth,
And causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way.
25 They grope in the dark without light,
And he maketh them to stagger like a drunken man.
13 Lo, mine eye hath seen all *this*,
Mine ear hath heard and understood it.
2 What ye know, *the same* do I know also:
I am not inferior unto you.
3 Surely I would speak to the Almighty,

---

of His own nature. Duhm thinks that if the verse is genuine the sense suggested by the context is that while God overthrows the rulers He brings the poorer classes out of obscurity to honour. This gives a good contrast, but it seems a forced sense to impose on the words.

23. bringeth them in: generally the word is translated as in the marg., 'leadeth them away,' i.e. into captivity. This gives a good but rather questionable sense, since elsewhere the word means 'to lead' with a favourable significance.

24. heart: used, as often, of the intellect. As the first line of verse 21 is found in Ps. cvii. 40, so the second line of that verse is found in the second line here. The word for 'wilderness' is that used in Gen. i. 2 for 'waste' in the description of chaos.

25. For the reference to the 'drunken man' the same Psalm may be compared, Ps. cvii. 27. The word translated 'maketh them to stagger' is the same as that rendered 'causeth them to wander' in the preceding verse. When God deprives the leaders of understanding, they still keep on moving, but only in an aimless, witless way.

xiii. **1.** In answer to the accusation that he does not understand God's action, Job replies that he understands it perfectly well, as is plain from the description he has just given. This knowledge he has gained by his own observation and what he has heard from others. Nature and history alike have been his teachers.

2. He understands it as well as the friends. Their condescending airs of superiority are quite out of place.

3. Surely should be 'but'; it is the same word as that translated

And I desire to reason with God.
But ye are forgers of lies, 4
Ye are all physicians of no value.
Oh that ye would altogether hold your peace! 5
And it should be your wisdom.
Hear now my reasoning, 6

'but' in verse 4. It is not agreed whether Job means 'Though I know this well, yet I wish to plead with God,' or 'But I wish to speak to God, not to you.' The former is perhaps favoured by the repetition of 'but' at the beginning of verse 4, which suggests that the attack on the friends begins with verse 4. On the other hand the immediate impression made by verse 3 and supported by the context is that Job is contrasting debate with God and debate with the friends. So much so, indeed, that the suggestion made by some that 'but' should be struck out at the beginning of verse 4, as an incorrect repetition from verse 3, would have to be seriously considered, if its presence constituted an insuperable barrier to this view of the passage. Budde, however, thinks that the repetition is merely intended to sharpen the antithesis of verse 3. If this interpretation is correct verses 4–12 do not constitute a digression.

4. forgers of lies: cf. Ps. cxix. 69. 'Plasterers of lies' would be a nearer translation. The word translated 'forgers' is the participle of a verb meaning 'to smear over.' The meaning may be that they plaster Job with their false statements, so as to make him seem quite other than he really is. But more probably the meaning is that they smear their lies over God's government of the world, so as to cover up all its hideous defects and give it a fair appearance. Thus we get a thought similar to what we find in verses 7–12 when Job charges the friends with lying for God. Some give the verb the sense 'to sew' or 'stitch together,' and this seems to underlie the translation 'forgers of lies,' but this view is apparently incorrect.

physicians of no value. This is the usual translation, though some of our best authorities think the verb, of which the word rendered 'physicians' is the participle, bears here its original sense to patch, which gives apparently a better parallelism with 'plasterers of lies.' We might then translate 'patchers of vanities.' Unfortunately the verb seems not to occur elsewhere in this sense.

5. The friends have talked about wisdom, but so foolishly that their only chance of a reputation for wisdom is henceforth to hold their peace. Cf. Prov. xvii. 28.

6. We should probably, with most recent commentators, adopt

And hearken to the pleadings of my lips.
7 Will ye speak unrighteously for God,
And talk deceitfully for him?
8 Will ye respect his person?
Will ye contend for God?
9 Is it good that he should search you out?
Or as one deceiveth a man, will ye deceive him?
10 He will surely reprove you,
If ye do secretly respect persons.
11 Shall not his excellency make you afraid,
And his dread fall upon you?
12 Your memorable sayings *are* proverbs of ashes,
Your defences *are* defences of clay.

---

the reading presupposed in the LXX, 'Hear now the rebuke of my mouth.' This gives a complete parallelism with the next line.

8. respect his person: i.e. show partiality towards God; marg. 'shew him favour,' cf. xxxii. 21. The phrase literally means to lift up the face, and is used of judges who accept bribes and show undue favouritism in consequence, then it comes to mean to show partiality. It is also used in a good sense to show favour or kindness. There is a biting irony in the choice of this expression, considering the relative position of God and man.

contend for God: act as His special pleaders.

9. God is too great to be flattered, too keen of perception to be beguiled. It will not be a pleasant experience for them when God strips bare their paltry souls and shows that which masqueraded as pious reverence to be cowardly sycophancy.

deceiveth . . . deceive: marg. 'mocketh . . . mock.'

10. It is noteworthy as showing the conflict of feeling in Job, that while he attacks with the utmost boldness the unrighteousness of God's conduct he should have such deep-rooted confidence in His righteousness as to believe Him incapable of tolerating a lying defence even of Himself. As the poet does elsewhere, so here he lets an unconscious prediction fall from the lips of one of the speakers, cf. xlii. 7, 8.

11. Job knows the dread He can inspire only too well; one of the two conditions which he implores God to grant him, when He appears, is that His terror should not make him afraid (verse 21, ix. 34).

12. The 'memorable sayings' are their traditional maxims,

Hold your peace, let me alone, that I may speak, 13
And let come on me what will.
Wherefore should I take my flesh in my teeth, 14
And put my life in mine hand?

---

with which they sought to silence Job, but they are ashes, dead, obsolete relics of what may once have been glowing convictions at which men warmed their hands.

defences. The word may mean the boss of a shield, and Duhm takes it so here, on the ground that a clay breastwork is not a contemptible defence. But the text gives a better sense; the poet is thinking, not of the toughness of clay, but of its brittleness as compared with stone.

13. He is a desperate man; vainly will his friends seek to restrain him from speaking all his mind to God's face, reckless of the punishment his rash defiance may provoke.

14. The verse is difficult. Its interpretation may start best from the second line. The proverb to put the life in the hand means elsewhere to expose oneself to deadly peril. It is quite clear from verse 13 that Job is not asking why he should endanger his life; he has just expressed his intention to do so. We are not warranted in imposing another sense on the words, and explaining, Why should I strive desperately to save my life? Accordingly the line cannot be a question; it affirms a purpose, I will take my life in my hand. The sense of the metaphor in the first line is disputed. Several think the figure is that of a wild beast, which takes its prey in its teeth and carries it away safely. In that case the verse would mean, 'Why should I seek to save my life? nay, I will expose it to the utmost peril.' But the close parallelism between the two lines is almost decisive in favour of taking them to mean the same thing. Probably no one would have thought of contrasting the two metaphors if it had not been for the interrogative at the beginning of the verse. If the two metaphors mean the same thing, the interrogative is as unsuitable to the first as to the second line. It does not seem to be legitimate to give the two words translated 'wherefore' a non-interrogative sense, as the margin does in its translation 'At all adventures I will take, &c.' Bickell, followed by Duhm and Klostermann, avoids the difficulty by attaching these words to verse 13 and thus making the second line of verse 13 of more normal length. The translation of verse 13 remains the same, but it is not clear that the phrase 'let come on me what upon what,' as we could translate it literally, can bear the sense 'let come on me what may.' It is a much simpler way to the same end to strike out these two words. They have clearly arisen through dittography of the last two

15 Though he slay me, yet will I wait for him:
Nevertheless I will maintain my ways before him.
16 This also shall be my salvation;
For a godless man shall not come before him.

---

words of verse 13, which are almost identical in Hebrew (*'al māh* being an incorrect repetition of *'ālay māh*). They are also wanting in the LXX. We should then translate, 'I will take my flesh in my teeth, and my life I will put in my hand.' Job will dare the uttermost peril, but speak he will.

15. This verse also is difficult. The A. V. translation, 'Though he slay me, *yet* will I trust in him,' which is that of the Vulgate, is impossible, since it is utterly out of harmony with the context. It is very beautiful in itself, and no doubt what Job ought to have said, and what he would have said after the vision of God. But it is singularly unfortunate, since it is one of the few fragments in the poem which are widely known, and has thus created an entirely false impression as to Job's real attitude. Unhappily the text is uncertain, and, as in some other cases, we have to choose between *lō'* 'not' and *lō* 'for him' or 'for it.' The R. V. translates the latter in the text. But the translation 'Though he slay me' is indefensible, for the line makes in the R. V. much the same impression as in the A. V. The margin gives what must be the general sense with this reading, 'Behold, he will slay me; I wait for him,' i. e. for Him to strike. We might translate 'for it,' i. e. for death. It is more probable, however, that we should read the negative. The R. V. margin then offers two alternatives, 'I will not wait' or 'I have no hope.' The objection to the former, adopted by Davidson and Dillmann, is that it does not yield a very good sense, though we may compare vi. 11. The latter is that more generally adopted, and is still retained by Budde, in spite of Dillmann's assertion that the verb does not mean 'to hope.' Duhm translates 'I cannot hold out.' In his *Job and Solomon* (p. 28) Cheyne translated 'I can wait no longer,' explaining 'I can wait' to mean 'I can be patient.' Now he reads, with a slight alteration, 'I will not desist,' i. e. from self-justification. The precise sense of the line is uncertain, fortunately the general sense is clear.

16. This: marg. 'He,' but less suitably. Job's salvation consists in what he proceeds to say in the second line, which should be introduced by 'That' as in the margin rather than 'For' as in the text. The meaning may be, God permits no unrighteous man to come before Him, this is my salvation, for I shall come before Him, and thus my righteousness will be manifested. Or the hindrance may lie not in God's exclusion of the wicked, but in the unwillingness of the godless to enter His presence. In

Hear diligently my speech, 17
And let my declaration be in your ears.
Behold now, I have ordered my cause; 18
I know that I am righteous.
Who is he that will contend with me? 19
For now shall I hold my peace and give up the ghost.
Only do not two things unto me, 20
Then will I not hide myself from thy face:
Withdraw thine hand far from me; 21
And let not thy terror make me afraid.
Then call thou, and I will answer; 22

---

that case the argument is, I am eager to come before God, this proves my righteousness. In any case the verse is noteworthy as an expression of Job's conviction of God's righteousness, in striking contrast to the mood which for the most part dominates him. Yet it would be quite possible for an immoral Deity to be strict in His demands on men, a Nero legislating against vice.

18. Job is prepared to plead his case against God; he has set in order his arguments, he is confident that he will triumph. We should substitute the marg. 'shall be justified' for **am righteous.** Job is not asserting his innocence, but his assurance that he will win his case and his innocence be made plain.

19. Cf. the similar words of the Servant of Yahweh, Isa. l. 8. No one will be found to undertake a case so unsupported by evidence. The second line seems to mean, If any one should be found to dispute my righteousness, I should die; though it may be taken as in R. V. The marg. 'For now if I hold my peace, I shall give up the ghost' is less likely.

20. As in ix. 34 Job asks God to grant him two requests in order that his trial may be fair, and he may be able to do justice to his case. Let God remove His afflicting hand and not overwhelm him with Divine terrors. Then he will plead as plaintiff or defendant as God may choose. He is so confident of his cause that his adversary may freely select the mode of procedure. When God does appear He fulfils neither of Job's requests. He speaks from the storm to Job still suffering from his disease.

It is rather strange that in explication of the negative general appeal the first particular should be stated in positive form. The general sense is clear, but formally, at any rate, the passage would have run more regularly if the first line of verse 21 had run, 'let thy hand no longer smite me.'

22. Cf. the similar expression in xiv. 15, but with how

Or let me speak, and answer thou me.
23 How many are mine iniquities and sins?
Make me to know my transgression and my sin.
24 Wherefore hidest thou thy face,
And holdest me for thine enemy?
25 Wilt thou harass a driven leaf?
And wilt thou pursue the dry stubble?
26 For thou writest bitter things against me,
And makest me to inherit the iniquities of my youth:

---

different a sense! Here a call to a lawsuit, there a call to fellowship and love.

23. Job begins his plea by a demand to know the charges against him. Like many another prisoner he has been kept in ignorance of the accusations he has to meet. He does not mean that he has committed no sins at all, but that he has done nothing which deserves punishment so severe. His suffering reflects God's attitude to him, how does God justify that attitude?

24. Some think that there is a pause after verse 23, while Job waits to be informed of the indictment his adversary has written, and that when God still keeps silence, he breaks out with the remonstrance 'Wherefore hidest thou thy face?' But probably the allusion is not to God's refusal to meet his challenge, but to His harsh treatment of him in general.

25. Once more Job pleads his insignificance as a reason why God should not deign any longer to harass him. He is like a leaf that has fallen from the tree and is driven by the gentlest breeze, or the light stubble that scuds before the slightest breath of wind. Should the Infinite One, with all the mightiest forces in Nature at His call, amuse Himself with the paltry sport of persecuting one so frail that he is at the mercy of the weakest forces? Has God no magnanimity, no self-respect, that He stoops so low?

26. thou writest bitter things: i. e. God ordains bitter punishment, not, as Hitzig took it, prescribes bitter medicine. The metaphor is not of a physician, but of a judge writing the sentence.

the iniquities of my youth: cf. Ps. xxv. 7. Job can think of no other explanation of his suffering. He is not conscious of any sin of his manhood that God could bring against him. God has therefore to go back and rake up the long past transgressions of his immaturity, a singular proof of His harsh determination to punish him, if not on good grounds, then on bad.

Thou puttest my feet also in the stocks, and markest all my paths; 27
Thou drawest thee a line about the soles of my feet:
Though I am like a rotten thing that consumeth, 28
Like a garment that is moth-eaten.
Man that is born of a woman 14
Is of few days, and full of trouble.
He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: 2

---

27. in the stocks. Since the next clause implies a certain freedom of movement on Job's part, this translation is hardly correct, unless the two clauses refer to different times, which is unlikely. We should therefore think rather of a block of wood fastened on the foot of captives to hamper their movements and thus prevent their escape. As a further precaution God sets a watch on all Job's paths, i. e. apparently the paths by which he might attempt to get away from God.

soles of my feet: *lit.* 'the roots of my feet.' God draws lines closely round Job's feet, which he must not pass. But the expression 'roots of my feet' is strange. Duhm thinks that 'my feet' has been repeated here by mistake, and strikes it out, getting the sense, with rather different pointing, 'thou cuttest a line about my root.' In that case the metaphor is of a tree, the roots of which are cut lest they spread too far. To complete a four-lined stanza he adds here the last line of xiv. 5, 'thou settest' (LXX) 'its bound that it cannot overpass.' This is quite possibly right, at any rate so far as concerns the elimination of 'my feet.'

28. As the margin 'And he is like' intimates, we have a third person, not a first person, in the Hebrew. Several critics think the verse is unsuitable in its present connexion, and either strike it out or place it elsewhere in the context. If Duhm's view of the preceding verse be adopted, this verse follows fairly well on it. The root of the tree being prevented from spreading, the roots that are thus laid open rot. We should in that case translate 'and it is like.' Cheyne thinks it is a variant of xiv. 2. His restoration may be seen *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 2810.

xiv. **1.** It is probably best to take this verse as an independent sentence, though some, including Dillmann, think the sentence is completed in verse 2, translating 'Man, born of woman, few of days and full of trouble, cometh forth like a flower,' &c. Man's frailty is partly accounted for by his origin, he is born of woman 'the weaker vessel.'

2. is cut down: the marg. 'withereth' is probably to be pre-

He fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.
3 And dost thou open thine eyes upon such an one,
And bringest me into judgement with thee?
4 [M] Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.
5 [A] Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months is with thee,
And thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass;
6 Look away from him, that he may rest,
Till he shall accomplish, as an hireling, his day.

---

ferred, though the translation in the text is adopted by several. The LXX gives 'and falleth off.'

3. Job expresses amazement that God should scrutinize so minutely and punish so harshly the conduct of one so frail. For **me** it would be better to read 'him' with LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate.

4. We should certainly translate as in the marg., 'Oh that a clean thing could come out of an unclean! not one *can*.' The connexion is supposed to be: If man could only be free from sin, this severe punishment of sin would not be so unjust; but none achieve this freedom, and therefore, since all inherit a sinful nature, God ought to treat them more leniently. The passage is similar to iv. 17 ff., though Eliphaz urges the universal sinfulness of man rather in explanation of Job's suffering. We may also compare 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh.' The verse raises some difficulties. The second line, 'not one,' is abnormally short, and if this is not intentional may be a gloss, as Merx thinks, and as Dillmann admits may be the case. Philo omits the words. Ewald points the word translated 'not' differently, and gets the sense 'would that there were one.' Duhm thinks the shortness of the line is not due to its being a gloss, but to the omission of part of it. The thought required, he says, is, there is none without sins, and he cleverly suggests that a word meaning 'without sins' may have fallen out after the somewhat similar word translated 'out of an unclean.' It is very questionable, however, whether the verse can be naturally connected with its context, which reads much more smoothly without it. Bickell, Beer, and Cheyne strike it out, and Budde inclines to the same course. It is the sigh of a pious reader, written on the margin, and mistakenly introduced into the text.

6. Cf. Ps. xxxix. 13. The sufferer begs God to release him

For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will 7
sprout again,
And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, 8
And the stock thereof die in the ground;
Yet through the scent of water it will bud, 9
And put forth boughs like a plant.
But man dieth, and wasteth away: 10
Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?

---

from His malignant watchfulness. Man's lot at the best is bad, all his pleasure is such as the day labourer finds in his irksome 'day.' Let God cease to torment and no longer grudge him this poor pleasure, but leave him to endure only the common lot. For **accomplish** the marg. 'have pleasure in' should probably be preferred.

7. In this and the following verses Job urges the hopelessness of any life after death as a reason for his plea in verse 6. It is still customary near Damascus to cut down trees, the stumps of which, through watering, put forth new shoots, as here described. We may well think that the poet, by placing in Job's mouth this reference to the tree's indomitable vitality, meant subtly to suggest that it is irrational to think that what is granted to a tree can be denied to a man, though he be frail as a flower. Yet he does not explicitly draw the inference. The thought of a happy future life is before him, but he cannot trust it confidently. It is very instructive to compare the 'how much more' of Jesus when arguing from nature to man. 'If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more shall he clothe you.' 'Fear not: ye are of more value than many sparrows.'

10. While the tree hewn down to its stump, and its root all decayed, still holds on so tenaciously to life that at the slightest stimulus, the mere scent of water, it bursts into new shoots and foliage like a tender plant in the lusty vigour of its early growth, man dies and lies prostrate, his old haunts know him no more, he never rises out of death's everlasting sleep.

wasteth away: marg. 'lieth low.' The LXX reads 'and is gone.'

where is he: if the LXX 'and is no more' represents a different Hebrew original, it seems to be clearly inferior to that in the text.

11 *As* the waters fail from the sea,
And the river decayeth and drieth up;
12 So man lieth down and riseth not:
Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
Nor be roused out of their sleep.
13 Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,
That thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past,
That thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!
14 If a man die, shall he live *again*?
All the days of my warfare would I wait,
Till my release should come.

---

11. Quoted from Isa. xix. 5, if that passage is earlier. Several critics strike it out here as an interpolation. But the first line of verse 12 implies that a comparison has preceded, and must also be omitted with verse 11. There seems to be no sufficient reason for this. 'The sea' is used here of a sheet of inland water, possibly a river, more probably a lake. In Isa. xix. 5 it means the Nile. We might turn Job's illustration against him, for in its time the river which has vanished returns in flood.

12. Till the heavens be no more: i. e. never. Geiger, followed by several scholars, reads 'Till the heavens wear out.'

13. After this strenuous denial of the possibility that man should be wakened from the sleep of death, Job passionately expresses the wish that it might be otherwise. Would that he might be hidden in Sheol while God's wrath continued, shielded from it in that inaccessible abode, and then would that God might call him back to life, once more to enter into communion with Him. It is not for a renewal of fellowship with God in Sheol that Job longs, but escape from Sheol to communion with God on earth. He contemplates concealment in Sheol only while God's wrath continues.

until thy wrath be past, for pass it will (vii. 8, 21). Cf. Isa. xxvi. 20.

14. As the text stands Job breaks off to put the question, 'Is a life after death possible?' and then, without staying to answer it, continues the thought of the preceding verse. The question looks like a marginal annotation. We might, however, read 'and' instead of the interrogative particle, with Duhm, 'If a man might die

Thou shouldest call, and I would answer thee: 15
Thou wouldest have a desire to the work of thine hands.
But now thou numberest my steps: 16
Dost thou not watch over my sin?
My transgression is sealed up in a bag, 17
And thou fastenest up mine iniquity.

---

and live again,' which is in every way suitable and has support from the LXX. The time of his waiting seems to include both the rest of his life on earth and his time in Sheol, till he returns to full life again.

15. Cf. vii. 21, where the same thought is expressed, but less fully. Sooner or later God's fit of anger will be over. Then He will wish to renew His communion with Job. If meanwhile He keep him in Sheol, and then when His wayward mood has passed call him, how gladly he would respond, forgiving and forgetting all the harsh treatment he had received.

the work of thine hands: with the creature's claim on the loving care of its Creator. So Job urges that God should not oppress or scorn the work of His hands (x. 3), and points the strange contrast between the pains and skill God lavished on the formation of him and the wanton destruction to which He is reducing him.

16, 17. According to the usual view we have here a description of God's present hostility to him, and this is the view taken by the Revisers. Budde, however, argues in a very long note that it is a continuation of the description in the previous verses. In that case we should translate 'for then' instead of **but now.** The words **thou numberest my steps** are usually thought to refer to the strict and jealous scrutiny which God maintains over all Job's conduct, watching narrowly for his slightest slip. But in themselves they may have a good meaning, for God may watch over his steps with kindly interest to help him forward in all his true aspirations. The second line of verse 16 is more naturally rendered as a statement than as a question, 'Thou wouldest not watch over my sin.' Some, in fact, who think the reference is to God's present persecution, think it is obviously better to take the line as a statement, and correct, with the LXX, **watch** into 'pass over,' 'Thou dost not pass over my sin.' The expression to seal up transgression in a bag may mean to keep it safely treasured up against the sinner, or to seal it up as a sign that it is done with and will not be remembered against him. A similar ambiguity attaches to the last line. The translation **thou fastenest up mine iniquity** rests on the view that the verb means 'to glue

18 And surely the mountain falling cometh to nought,
And the rock is removed out of its place;
19 The waters wear the stones;
The overflowings thereof wash away the dust of the earth:
And thou destroyest the hope of man.
20 Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth;
Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away.

---

over,' which may be explained like the parallel verb in a favourable or an unfavourable sense. Budde argues that the verb means 'to whitewash,' and, as applied to sin, 'to palliate.' If we accept his view, the picture of blessed fellowship with God, begun in the preceding verse, becomes much fuller, and the fact that verse 18 begins with a very strong adversative particle makes it likely that the description to which it is opposed extends to the end of verse 17. We should accordingly translate:

For then thou wouldest number my steps,
Thou wouldest not watch over my sin;
Sealed up in a bag would be my transgression,
And thou wouldest palliate mine iniquity.

Ley follows Budde in his view of the passage.

18. And surely should be 'But.' The connexion is, Such a future life is not to be hoped for, especially for so frail a thing as man. Even the mighty mountains perish and the hard stones are worn away, how can man escape this universal fate? Smend and Beer think the writer is contrasting the change to which all things are subject with the unchanging lot of the dead, but this seems not to be in his mind.

falling: it is objected that mountains perish even if they do not fall. Some read 'will surely fall,' but Duhm's suggestion 'will surely perish' is better, though the text perhaps needs no emendation.

19. The overflowings thereof. The Hebrew is a little irregular. Budde suggests 'waterspout,' slightly changing the Hebrew.

thou destroyest the hope of man. With what a crash this comes! But the sense is not quite clear. It is most obvious for us to think of the hope of a happy future life, cf. 'there is hope of a tree if it be cut down that it will sprout again' (verse 7). Yet this can hardly be described by so general a term as 'the hope of man,' since Job refuses to accept it, and the poet himself can do no more than wish it may be true.

20. In his last struggle for life God worsts him, and his defeat

His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; 21
And they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.
But his flesh upon him hath pain, 22
And his soul within him mourneth.

---

is final. At the touch of death the face changes, soon to become a horror with corruption, and the soul passes to its banishment from God and all the warm life of earth.

21, 22. The dead have no knowledge of earthly affairs, even when they affect those dearest to them. They have utterly done with this life and all its interests, and are conscious only of their own pain. The marg. renders verse 22, 'Only for himself his flesh hath pain, and for himself his soul mourneth.' The text probably comes nearer the sense, though it translates the same word, **upon him** in one line and **within him** in the other. The word seems to be a more emphatic way of expressing 'his'; we might translate, 'But his own flesh hath pain, And his own soul mourneth.' It is very noteworthy that, while the soul is in Sheol and the body is in the grave, both are regarded as part of the self, and both suffer pain; the pain of the body being that caused by its decomposition—a gruesome thought.

The first cycle of the debate is ended, and its result has been to alienate the friends more and more from Job. They resent his tone of superior knowledge and the scorn with which he mocks their arguments. They had tried to be conciliatory and deal gently with the sufferer. But dear though their friend might be, truth was dearer still. And truth, as they understood it in this connexion, was the orthodox doctrine of retribution. Some grave sin must lie behind calamities so crushing and pain so intense. Yet they set out from the assumption of Job's fundamental piety, and seek to bring him to view his suffering as a chastisement sent in love for his good. But reluctantly they are compelled to abandon this position. Their well-meant admonitions exasperate the sufferer, conscious of his integrity, and goad him to yet more outspoken criticism of God's ways. If they resent his cavalier treatment of themselves, they are profoundly shocked by his attack on God. They meet the blaspheming heretic with outraged protestations and strenuous affirmations that God's ways are above criticism; He is Almighty and All-Wise, therefore He can do no wrong. Almighty and All-Wise He is, Job retorts, all the darker the wrong that He does!

And Job himself, how fared it with him? Certain of his own righteousness, yet sharing the friends' illusion that suffering

15 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,
2 Should a wise man make answer with vain knowledge,
And fill his belly with the east wind?

proved the anger of God, he was shut up to the inference that God's government was unrighteous. It was where it touched himself that he was most sensitive to the unrighteousness of God's dealings, but the conviction borne in upon him by his own case opened his eyes to the misery in the world and proved his contention on the larger scale. He sees on the throne of the universe an irresponsible tyrant, with no lofty character to match His power and wisdom, but cruel and unrighteous, animated by petty spite to torture the helpless. Yet the memory of all that earlier happiness and blessed fellowship with God has not lost its spell. Though he confidently asserts that it was all part of God's deliberate design to let no bitterness be wanting in his cup, yet in other moods he feels that the God, whom it had been his bliss to know, represented God in His truest self; hence he believes that God's estrangement from him may pass away and that once more He will seek him in love. He even contemplates the possibility that God might keep him in Sheol out of the reach of His anger, and when the wrath had yielded to love, call him back to life on earth. This hope he sets aside, but the thought that since men have failed him God Himself must take up his cause indicates the line on which Job will advance.

xv. 1–6. Eliphaz reproves Job for his empty and violent words, and for the irreligious tendency of his speech by which he is self-condemned.

xv. 7–16. Is he the primaeval man, who listened in the council of God, that he deems himself so wise? Does he know anything with which the friends are not familiar, seeing that age is on their side? Are the Divine consolations insufficient for him? Why should he turn against God? What is man, the unclean, before the holy God in whose sight the very heavens are not pure?

xv. 17–35. The wise have taught the wretched condition of the wicked man. All his days he is troubled with presentiment of evil for his impiety towards God, and his fate is untimely and disastrous.

2. It is possible that Eliphaz may refer to himself as the wise man, asking if he should answer Job with angry words. In that case we should have a parallel in Elihu's bombastic description of himself in xxxii. 18–20. But this is very unlikely, Eliphaz is taking up Bildad's words in viii. 2, and asks Job if it is the part of a wise man, as he claims to be, to utter 'knowledge of wind,' to fill himself with the violent east wind that he may pour it out in

Should he reason with unprofitable talk, 3
Or with speeches wherewith he can do no good?
Yea, thou doest away with fear, 4
And restrainest devotion before God.
For thine iniquity teacheth thy mouth, 5
And thou choosest the tongue of the crafty.
Thine own mouth condemneth thee, and not I; 6
Yea, thine own lips testify against thee.
Art thou the first man that was born? 7
Or wast thou brought forth before the hills?

---

rasping and empty words. Job is, to use our colloquial term, a wind-bag, but the reference to the east wind brings out the turbulent and bitter character of his speech.

3. So 'wise' a man surely should not utter long speeches which avail nothing for his justification.

4. But his speeches are marred by a darker fault than bitter violence and windy ineffective rhetoric. They are calculated to do away with true religion, which Eliphaz characteristically calls 'fear.' The meaning of the second line is not quite certain. Usually it is explained as in R. V., **restrainest** being taken to mean literally 'diminishest.' For **devotion** the margin gives 'meditation.' Duhm explains that it is the reverential stillness which man should observe before God; to 'take it away' by loud and unseemly utterance is serious wickedness.

5. The marg. reads, 'thy mouth teacheth thine iniquity,' i. e. Job's speech makes plain his guilt, but the text is probably to be preferred. Job's wicked heart inspires his blaspheming tongue. He craftily defends himself by accusing God and the friends. Duhm suggests that 'the crafty' may have been a technical term for the wise of the world, whose serpent-subtlety (Gen. iii. 1) was opposed to the true wisdom, and their sceptical criticism to the fear of God.

6. There is no need for Eliphaz to condemn him, his own utterances convict him. Perhaps there is a reference to xiii. 6. 'What need we any further witness?' A man who talks against God is stamped by that very fact as a sinner of the deepest dye. That he denies his guilt and seeks to brand God with the stigma of immorality only makes his sin the more glaring. Duhm places this verse before verse 13.

7. Eliphaz now submits Job's claims to be so very wise to a fire of sarcastic questions that remind the reader of God's ironical interrogations in His speech out of the storm, especially

8 Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God?
And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?
9 What knowest thou, that we know not?
What understandest thou, which is not in us?
10 With us are both the grayheaded and the very aged men,
Much elder than thy father.

---

xxxviii. 4, 21. Since age brings wisdom, Job must be very old, seeing he is so wise! But mere age would not make him so very wise as he is. He must be the primaeval man, of whom the myths tell, a being brought into existence before the creation of the world, who because he sat in the Divine council and hearkened to the Divine plans is dowered with superhuman wisdom. The figure of this primaeval man occurs nowhere else in the O. T., but it has close analogies in the Divine Wisdom of Prov. viii. 22–31, 'brought forth before the hills,' and associated with God in Creation as a master workman. Dillmann compares Manu among the Indians. Duhm thinks that for 'hills' in this passage we should read 'the high ones,' i. e. the angels. We may, however, compare Ps. xc. 2 as well as Prov. viii. 25 for our present text, though Duhm's text would give an excellent sense, and harmonize well with the interest taken by the speaker in the angels.

8. The marg. reads, 'Dost thou hearken in the council?' if we substitute 'didst' for 'dost' we have the author's meaning. He is not referring to habitual attendance in the Divine assembly, but to presence at the heavenly council when the creation of the universe was planned.

restrain is the same word as that similarly translated in verse 4. Here it implies rather 'to draw,' as in several other passages; the line means, 'didst thou take wisdom into thyself?'

9. Returning from this lofty flight of the sarcastic imagination to the blunt actualities as he saw them, Eliphaz asks Job in what respect his knowledge surpasses theirs. 'What knowest thou that we know not?' What indeed, but crushing disaster, extreme pain, and the crash of that belief in whose strength he had lived!

10. Far from being the primaeval man, older than creation, he is not even the oldest in that company. Eliphaz is probably referring to himself; he is older than Job's father, therefore, he implies, much wiser than Job. He forgets that it is not mere length of days, but the intensity with which they have been lived that counts for wisdom, just as the grey-headed may become so not simply by lapse of time, but in a single night into which years seem to have been packed. Eliphaz had gained such wisdom as comes through long life to a high-minded and pious man, in

Are the consolations of God too small for thee, 11
And the word *that dealeth* gently with thee?
Why doth thine heart carry thee away? 12
And why do thine eyes wink?
That thou turnest thy spirit against God, 13
And lettest *such* words go out of thy mouth.
What is man, that he should be clean? 14
And he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?
Behold, he putteth no trust in his holy ones; 15
Yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight.

---

sympathy with ancient tradition and not unvisited by revelations from the other world. But ripe as he was in many ways, his placid career had known no such tragic break as had taught the much younger Job the pressure of problems whose very existence was unguessed by Eliphaz, undreamed of in his philosophy.

11. The reference is to his former speech, which was mild in its tone and ministered **the consolations of God** in the thought of his blessedness whom God chastens. They were not simply his own words of comfort, but a Divine origin is claimed for them, inasmuch as the speaker was a recipient of celestial revelation. Job, however, felt that God's actions spoke louder than any words He might speak at third-hand through Eliphaz, all the more that He resolutely refused to speak Himself. The marg. gives in place of the second line, 'Or is there any secret thing with thee?' But the text is much to be preferred.

12. wink, i. e. roll in anger or perhaps pride. But some, including Budde, think that for this word, which occurs only here, we should read a very similar word meaning to be lofty, as in Prov. xxx. 13, 'There is a generation, Oh how lofty are their eyes!'

13. spirit: rather 'breath' in the sense of anger. The strangeness of the second line is mitigated in the R. V. by the insertion of *such* before 'words.' Instead of 'words' Duhm reads the word translated in xxiii. 2 'rebellious' or 'bitter.'

14. Cf. xiv. 4. In this passage Eliphaz returns to the thought already revealed to him in the experience related iv. 12–21. But here he speaks more strongly.

born of a woman. Cf. xiv. 1. Man's origin inspires no expectation of his purity; an Oriental estimate of woman.

15. holy ones: the angels as in v. 1.

the heavens: whether this is to be explained as the sky, or

16 How much less one that is abominable and corrupt,
A man that drinketh iniquity like water!
17 I will shew thee, hear thou me;
And that which I have seen I will declare:
18 (Which wise men have told

---

is a term for the inhabitants of the heavens, the angels, is uncertain. The material heavens are in Exod. xxiv. 10 a symbol of clearness. Dillmann and Davidson also appeal to the parallel xxv. 5. But the phrase 'the stars are not pure in his sight' rather favours the reference to heavenly beings, on account of the close connexion between the stars and the angels. The stars were regarded as animated beings. That, as Dillmann urges, in the thought of antiquity ethical and physical cleanness and uncleanness played into each other is true; yet the purity in question here is so distinctly ethical that we should probably let that, along with the parallelism with 'holy ones,' decide us in favour of taking 'the heavens' here to mean the heavenly beings.

16. The reference, as the context indicates, is to man in general, not to Job in particular, though Job if he likes may make this personal application. To drink like water is, as Duhm takes it, to drink in full gulps, stronger liquids being drunk cautiously; others take it, as eagerly as a thirsty man drinks water, or that it is as natural for man to do evil as for him to drink water. For **one that is** the marg. gives 'that which is.'

corrupt: originally used of milk that has turned. It occurs in Hebrew only here and in Ps. xiv. 3=liii. 3, each time in an ethical sense.

17. Eliphaz, having completed his reproof of Job, now describes the evil case of the wicked, introducing it with three verses, guaranteeing it to be an ancient wisdom, unspoiled by foreign admixture. Ley omits verses 17-19 (18-20, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 38, n. 1, seems to be a slip for 17-19). In verse 17 Eliphaz talks down to Job. The truth in which he will instruct him is certified to him by his own observation.

18, 19. Yet Eliphaz is a traditionalist just as much as Bildad, and what is in harmony with his own observation is guaranteed by the tradition on which it rests. The exclusion of foreign elements seems to refer to the time when the fathers formed the tradition rather than to the time during which their descendants, 'the wise,' transmitted it. The speaker seems to think that the native wisdom of the indigenous inhabitants could not have been created in its purity, had strangers imported their novel and, as a patriot would consider, lower ways of looking at things. The

From their fathers, and have not hid it;
Unto whom alone the land was given, 19
And no stranger passed among them:)
The wicked man travaileth with pain all his days, 20
Even the number of years that are laid up for the oppressor.
A sound of terrors is in his ears; 21
In prosperity the spoiler shall come upon him:
He believeth not that he shall return out of darkness, 22

---

poet speaks from some experience of racial contamination, and the inrush of new peoples into old-established settlements. He had probably heard the orthodox bewail the deterioration of theology that had arisen from these corroding influences. It is a sad fact that higher and lower races seem as if they cannot live side by side without moral deterioration for both. The worst qualities on either side seem to be brought into play, and the higher race in particular exhibits a fiendishness in its treatment of the lower that would antecedently have been regarded as wholly impossible.

From their fathers. The obvious translation of the Hebrew words would be 'and have not hid from their fathers.' Since this is impossible in the context, the text must be translated as in R. V. But since it is likely that the poet would not have expressed this thought in such a way that the language suggested a totally different and inappropriate thought, we should probably omit 'from' with the LXX, and translate 'And their fathers have not hidden.' The function of 'the wise' is not to create the true doctrine, but to transmit it. The creation lies with 'their fathers.' Antiquity is thus the test of truth, the earliest generations standing nearest to the source.

20. The teaching which the wise have handed down is now given. While the wicked lives in outward prosperity he is constantly tormented by forebodings of disaster. Instead of **travaileth with pain** several ancient versions, reading a slightly different word, give 'boasts,' which is adopted by Beer, but which does not suit the next verse very well. For the second line the marg. gives the less satisfactory alternative, 'And years that are numbered are laid up for the oppressor.'

21. All the time he fancies he hears the dreaded disaster coming upon him; he anticipates the spoiler in the midst of his prosperity.

22. He believes that when the darkness of misfortune, so long

And he is waited for of the sword:
23 He wandereth abroad for bread, *saying*, Where is it?
He knoweth that the day of darkness is ready at his hand:
24 Distress and anguish make him afraid;
They prevail against him, as a king ready to the battle:

---

apprehended, closes in upon him, he will not be able to find his way into the light of prosperity. It is, however, quite likely that we should simply read 'He shall not depart out of darkness' as in verse 30, the first line of that verse being probably simply a variant of this.

waited for: several scholars adopt Ewald's suggestion to read 'laid up for' as in verse 20; the alteration is trifling.

23. Instead of **Where is it?** the LXX, adopting a different pointing, gives 'Vulture'; this cannot, however, be adopted without emending the first word. We might read with Siegfried 'he is given,' in which case the line would run, 'he is given to be vulture's food.' This follows well on the reference to his death by the sword; he dies on the field and vultures eat his flesh, cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 44; Isa. xviii. 6; Ezek. xxxix. 17–20. The second line might then remain as it is. But it is rather long. Several suggestions have been made to reduce it to normal length. Budde thinks **is ready** and **at his hand** are mutually exclusive variants. Some scholars follow the LXX and connect **the day of darkness**, which in the Hebrew stands at the end of verse 3, with the following verse. In that case further alteration of the text is inevitable. G. H. B. Wright translates 'He knows his doom is fixed.' For *'yādhō*, 'at his hand,' he very cleverly suggests *pīdhō*, 'his misfortune.' This word occurs also in xii. 5, and the correctness of the emendation, which involves the change only of a single letter, is made more probable by the fact that in xii. 5 we also have the word here translated 'is ready.' Otherwise Duhm's substitution of 'disaster' (as in xxxi. 3) for 'is ready' (*neker* for *nākōn*), suggested by the LXX, 'He knows that disaster is at his hand,' might seem preferable.

24. Connecting 'the day of darkness' with this verse we should translate, 'The day of darkness makes him afraid, Distress and anguish prevail against him, as a king ready to the battle.' The word translated **battle** occurs nowhere else (though Duhm thinks the same consonants should be similarly pointed in Isa. xxix. 3), and its meaning is uncertain, though the translation is probably correct. Duhm thinks the line hardly suitable here, and supposes it to have been originally a gloss on verse 26.

Because he hath stretched out his hand against God, 25
And behaveth himself proudly against the Almighty;
He runneth upon him with a *stiff* neck, 26
With the thick bosses of his bucklers:
Because he hath covered his face with his fatness, 27
And made collops of fat on his flanks;
And he hath dwelt in desolate cities, 28
In houses which no man inhabited,

---

25. Several scholars regard verses 25–28 (Duhm verses 25–28[b]) as an insertion. Duhm argues that they describe, not the lot of the godless, but their manner of procedure, with reference, as it would seem, to particular people and circumstances no longer precisely known to us. But why should not Eliphaz justify the lot of the godless in this way? Granting that they speak of a tyrant rather than an individual in private station, this would not be unfitting as an extreme example. But it is not clear that he has anything so definite in his mind.

behaveth himself proudly: or as in marg. 'biddeth defiance to.'

26. with is better than the marg. 'upon.'

27. Budde thinks the description refers to the stubbornness of the sinner, generally the verse is supposed to mean that the sinner battens in luxury.

28. The sinner is guilty of such flagrant impiety that he rebuilds desolate cities, or houses that ought not to be inhabited. Cities might have been destroyed by the judgement of God, like the cities of the Plain, for their wickedness, or overthrown for idolatry (Deut. xiii. 12–18), or they might lie under the ban, like Jericho. Such places it was supposed to be wicked to rebuild. The ruins were haunted by uncanny monsters, Lilith and the satyr, as well as by such denizens of desolate places as are recognized by Natural History. Hence they were held in superstitious dread and carefully avoided, especially at night-time. An instructive commentary may be found in Isa. xiii. 20–22, xxxiv. 10–17. Of Babylon we read in the former passage, 'It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there.' A house might also be one that ought not to be inhabited on account of ceremonial uncleanness.

inhabited: marg. 'would inhabit,' but 'should inhabit' would represent the meaning better. Ley thinks the reference is to Nebuchadnezzar peopling ruined cities with captive Jews. He refers iii. 14 also to Nebuchadnezzar.

Which were ready to become heaps.
29 He shall not be rich, neither shall his substance continue,
Neither shall their produce bend to the earth.
30 He shall not depart out of darkness;
The flame shall dry up his branches,
And by the breath of his mouth shall he go away.
31 [M] Let him not trust in vanity, deceiving himself:
For vanity shall be his recompence.

Which were ready to become heaps. This translation suggests that the houses were on the point of crumbling into ruins. The meaning of the text is rather that they were destined to become and for ever remain heaps. The LXX connects, in a different text, this clause with the first two words of verse 29. Duhm accepts this, and supposes that the quatrain, begun with the last two words of verse 23, is here completed, what he has gotten others shall take away; he compares v. 5.

29. their produce bend to the earth: marg. 'their possessions be extended on the earth.' The word translated 'their produce' occurs nowhere else, and its meaning is uncertain. Moreover, the plural 'their' is difficult, referring to a singular antecedent. It is generally thought that the text is corrupt. Numerous emendations have been proposed, of these perhaps we might adopt Hitzig's 'neither shall their' (better 'his') 'ear of corn bend to the earth,' i. e. it is not filled with grain. Duhm thinks conjectures are useless, since several words must have fallen out; the connexion, he says, shows that the godless is compared to a plant which goes to the ground. Siegfried gives up emendation as hopeless, and Ley leaves a blank. Hitzig rejected the verse, and Dillmann follows him, on the ground that 'he shall not be rich' does not suit the earlier part of the description. Budde retains the verse.

30. The first line is probably to be deleted as a variant of the first line of verse 22. The third line seems to mean in the present text, that he shall vanish by the breath of God's mouth. But this hardly suits the metaphor of a tree; probably we should read 'and his fruit is whirled away by the wind.'

31. Following Beer, Budde, and Duhm we may with much plausibility regard this verse as a later insertion. It interrupts the metaphor of the tree with a rather abstract admonition which is also out of place at this stage. See, further, note on verse 35. **Vanity** means 'iniquity' in the first line and 'disaster' in the second.

[A] It shall be accomplished before his time, 32
And his branch shall not be green.
He shall shake off his unripe grape as the vine, 33
And shall cast off his flower as the olive.
For the company of the godless shall be barren, 34
And fire shall consume the tents of bribery.
They conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity, 35
And their belly prepareth deceit.

---

32. The present text gives a tolerable sense, but the parallelism is incomplete, and the LXX reads differently. Of the emendations proposed it seems best either to connect the last word of verse 31 with this verse, pointing it differently, so that instead of 'his recompence' we should read 'his palm-branch,' or leave 'his recompence' at the end of verse 31, but suppose that verse 32 began with the same consonants, only with the sense 'his palm-branch.' We should then translate 'his palm-branch shall wither before its time,' correcting 'shall be accomplished' (marg. 'paid in full') into 'shall wither' (*timmōl* for *timmālē'*). The word translated 'branch' in the second line means 'palm-branch.'

33. Hirzel points out that the vine does not cast its unripe grapes, we must then, if the metaphor is correct, take the verb in the sense that it does not bring its unripe grapes to maturity. On the second line Thomson may be quoted, 'The olive is the most prodigal of all fruit-bearing trees in flowers. It literally bends under the load of them. But then, not one in a hundred comes to maturity. The tree casts them off by millions, as if they were of no more value than flakes of snow, which they closely resemble' (*The Land and the Book*, pp. 54, 55). See further Wetzstein in Delitzsch's Commentary.

34. bribery, by which the rich won their case in the law-courts against the poor whom they oppressed, is here selected as a common and flagrant form of evil-doing.

35. The first line occurs also Isa. lix. 4, in a very similar form. Since in that passage we also have, 'they trust in vanity and speak lies,' we may assume that if verse 31 is a later addition it may have originally been a gloss on verse 35, suggested to a reader by the passage in Isaiah. Cf. also Ps. vii. 14; Isa. xxxiii. 11.

Eliphaz adopts here a tone strikingly different from that of his first speech. He had become convinced that Job's utterances about God were not mere surface froth, but represented his settled mind. With such a blasphemer strong measures must be taken, hence his picture of the fate of the godless, while intended as an answer to Job's assertion that it was well with the wicked, also

16 Then Job answered and said,
2 I have heard many such things:
Miserable comforters are ye all.
3 Shall vain words have an end?
Or what provoketh thee that thou answerest?

---

served the purpose of holding up a warning to Job. As yet Eliphaz does not take the step of directly applying this to Job; it is a general description that he gives, but the application is all that remains to be made.

xvi. 1–5. Job replies that he would fain hear no more platitudes from his tormenting comforters; he could himself, were the positions reversed, administer to them the same eloquent lip-consolation.

xvi. 6–17. He now complains of God's settled hostility and the ferocious onslaughts He has made upon him, in spite of his innocence.

xvi. 18—xvii. 9. He appeals against his fate, and rises to the assurance that his vindicator is in heaven. From man he turns to God to maintain his cause, for soon he must die, in spite of the delusive hopes held out by the friends. Let God be his surety to God, for the friends have no understanding, though they invite Job to the feast of reason they provide. Job is a byword among the people, and reduced to the last extremities. [His case arouses the indignation of the godly, but the righteous shall hold on his way with increasing strength.]

xvii. 10–16. In spite of the glowing promises of the friends, life is at its end for Job. His only hope is Sheol and the grave.

2. Job begins by stigmatizing the speeches of the friends as made up of insufferable repetitions. He does not mean that he has heard at former times from others what they now tell him, but that they can only repeat the same things over and over again. That their speeches were a string of platitudes he has told them before; and it is bad enough to have to listen to platitudes once, but when these dreary commonplaces are reiterated by candid and condescending friends by way of consolation, the victim may well exclaim, 'I have heard enough of this talk from you and your friends. Tormenting comforters are ye all.'

miserable comforters: marg. 'wearisome comforters.' Cheyne translates 'tormenting comforters.'

3. vain words: Heb. 'words of wind,' with a reference to xv. 2, retorting Eliphaz's description of Job's speeches on himself. It is true to nature that the poet should make Job quite unconscious how full of provocation to the friends his speeches were.

I also could speak as ye do; 4
If your soul were in my soul's stead,
I could join words together against you,
And shake mine head at you.
But I would strengthen you with my mouth, 5
And the solace of my lips should assuage *your grief.*
Though I speak, my grief is not assuaged: 6
And though I forbear, what am I eased?

4. How easy, he scornfully reflects, to be dispassionately, coldly critical when our own welfare and reputation are not involved. He, too, could speak to them as they are speaking to him, were they the sufferers and he the critical spectator. He could play the unctuous moralist admonishing the transgressor, and scandalized at their behaviour shake his head over them. How differently he had himself acted is clear from the words of Eliphaz (iv. 3, 4), to say nothing of his own self-vindication at the end of the book.

I could join words together: I could compose eloquent speeches, eloquent because I could weave my words artistically together, the intellectual exercise being undisturbed by emotion. The rhetorical character of your speeches shows that they are not the warm inartistic outpourings of your heart.

5. The R. V. translation gives an excellent sense, but the sense intended by the poet is quite different. Job continues in the same scornful strain, the stress lying on my **mouth** and **lips**; he could offer them mere words in their sore need, as they now offer mere words to him.

Perhaps, following the LXX and some commentators, we should read in the second line, 'And my lip-compassion I would not spare,' this involves simply an insertion of the negative, and reading the verb in the first instead of the third person. The verb has no object in the present Hebrew text. Some read my 'lip-compassion would sustain you,' or 'I would sustain you with my lip-compassion.'

6. The sense of the verse appears to be that given by the R. V., though the connexion with the context is not very clear, and the expression with which the second line closes, which is literally, 'What departeth from me?' is rather strange. Duhm thinks that **grief** is here the inward pain of compassion, and that the verse continues the preceding thought, If he spoke, his compassion would not be spared, and if he were silent, his silence would be eloquent with sympathy. This very ingenious interpretation is exposed to the difficulty that the meaning imposed upon 'grief' seems a little strained, while the expression does not suggest

7 But now he hath made me weary:
Thou hast made desolate all my company.
8 And thou hast laid fast hold on me, *which* is a witness *against me*:
And my leanness riseth up against me, it testifieth to my face.
9 He hath torn me in his wrath, and persecuted me;
He hath gnashed upon me with his teeth:
Mine adversary sharpeneth his eyes upon me.

---

a superficial, but a really heart-felt sympathy, and therefore does not well continue the ironical description of the preceding verses.

7. All his strength is spent, and God has deprived him of family and friends. Budde thinks that **now** should be 'Thou,' 'Thou, Thou alone hast wearied me out.' The change of persons in the present text creates a little awkwardness. Bickell divides the clauses differently and attaches to this verse the first word of verse 8. Duhm follows him in this, and with some textual changes gets the sense, 'Now He has wearied me out, astounded me, All my evil lays fast hold on me.' Job's reference to his **company** is curious, and the change to 'evil' is not difficult. Beer also emends on Bickell's lines.

8. According to the present verse-division God's grip of him is an expression for his calamities and disease. These testify to his wickedness. If we accept Bickell's division we should translate, 'It is a witness and riseth up against me, My leanness testifieth to my face.'

laid fast hold: the marg. gives 'shrivelled me up,' Dillmann objects that here this is too special, and in xxii. 16 impossible.

leanness: this translation is accepted by many scholars, and Ps. cix. 24 is quoted in support of it; he is worn to a skeleton by his disease, which proves him to be guilty in God's sight. Dillmann denies that the word bears this meaning and translates 'my lie,' which he interprets to mean 'my sufferings' testifying falsely against me. But so artificial and prosaic an expression of this idea can hardly be attributed to the poet. Budde suggests 'my vexation,' slightly altering the text, as in vi. 2, xxiii. 2; cf. xv. 5, 6.

9-11. Job describes God's attack upon him under the metaphor of a wild beast rending his prey. **Persecuted,** marg. 'hated,' is somewhat unexpected in such a description. The LXX suggests 'cast me down.' The third line speaks of glances like swords,

They have gaped upon me with their mouth; 10
They have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully:
They gather themselves together against me.
God delivereth me to the ungodly, 11
And casteth me into the hands of the wicked.
I was at ease, and he brake me asunder; 12

stabbing their victim. It secures much greater regularity of structure and parallelism if we read the plural, 'Mine adversaries sharpen their eyes upon me,' and thus make a couplet of it and the following line. Siegfried deletes verses 10, 11, the first line of verse 10 being also absent in LXX. It is in favour of this that the description of God's attack is broken by references to attacks by men and resumed in verse 12. It might further be added that while the former is described in metaphorical language, the latter are set forth without figure in plain language. Duhm takes the same view as Siegfried, except that he includes the last line of 9. This is an obvious improvement, for, as already indicated, this line should go with the first line of verse 10. He thinks the insertion has been taken from a Psalm, and is unsuitable to Job's situation. The decision on the last point is bound up with the view taken of the references to the outcasts in xxx. The three couplets do not seem unsuitable to Job's condition, but they are apparently not in their true place. G. H. B. Wright says that the proper place for verse 10 is naturally after 11. The same suggestion occurred independently to the present writer, only it would be better to place verse 11 before the last line of verse 9, reading, of course, the plural in that line. In that way the attack of the ungodly is not mentioned as something independent of the attack by God, but as part of it—the lion assails his prey, but flings a share to his jackals. At the same time the lapse into plain speech in the middle of a metaphorical description, combined with the introduction of human enemies in the description of a Divine assault, suggests that these six lines, beginning with verse 11, perhaps came originally before or after the rest of verses 9–14.

the ungodly: not Job's friends, but the outcasts, who mock and maltreat him. The word in the text means 'boy,' so in this book, xix. 18, xxi. 11. Those who think the same word is used here take it to mean insolent knaves, as if insolence were a boy's main quality, so that 'boy' and 'insolent knave' might be convertible terms. It is better to read a slightly different word meaning 'unrighteous,' though some retain the present text, assuming that it is a distinct word meaning 'unrighteous,' which nowhere else occurs.

12. Job now describes God's attack, according to the present

Yea, he hath taken me by the neck, and dashed me to pieces:
He hath also set me up for his mark.
13 His archers compass me round about,
He cleaveth my reins asunder, and doth not spare;
He poureth out my gall upon the ground.
14 He breaketh me with breach upon breach;
He runneth upon me like a giant.
15 I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin,

---

arrangement of the verses, under the figure apparently of a wrestler, who suddenly seizes his unsuspecting victim and dashes him in pieces. But we get a much more satisfactory sense when we connect this closely with the first two lines of verse 9. The wild beast has torn his prey with his claws, now he seizes him by the neck and dashes him in pieces. A full stop should have been placed at **pieces**, for with the third line a new metaphor is introduced, that of God as an archer, which extends to the end of verse 13.

I was at ease: cf. Job's own description of his happy life before his calamity.

13. For **archers** the marg. gives 'arrows' or 'mighty ones.' The sense 'arrows' cannot be proved by other instances, but to avoid confusion in the metaphor it is necessary to assume it here with the Versions and many scholars. Having set Job up as a target, God shoots at him, first letting His arrows whistle all about him, thus keeping him in suspense, dreading that every shaft would strike its mark, then sporting with him no longer, but sending every arrow home into his vitals, till He has strewed the ground with them. The realism of the description is very powerful; cf. vi. 4.

14. The metaphor now changes to that of an assault on a fortress. The Hebrew is remarkable for its accumulation of p's, r's and ts's, *yiphr^{e}tsēni pherets 'al-p^{e}nē phārets, yārūts ālay k^{e}gibbōr.* There is a good deal of onomatopoeia in the passage. Duhm places verse 17 after this verse. For 'giant' the marg. gives 'mighty man.'

15. sackcloth was worn next the skin (2 Kings vi. 30) in sign of mourning; it is not mentioned in i. 20 or ii. 8, but would be taken for granted. The expression is probably pregnant for, 'I have sewed sackcloth and put it on my skin;' though Davidson says that 'Job indicates that it is his habitual garment, which he

And have laid my horn in the dust.
My face is foul with weeping, 16
And on my eyelids is the shadow of death;
Although there is no violence in mine hands, 17
And my prayer is pure.
O earth, cover not thou my blood, 18

---

never puts off; though the word may also suggest the closeness with which it adheres to his shrunk and emaciated frame.'

laid my horn in the dust: the verb means properly 'to put into,' 'to thrust into.' It is an expression for complete humiliation, in contrast to the phrase 'to exalt the horn.' The marg. 'defiled' is adopted by some scholars, but there is no warrant for this translation; if it is preferred, a slight emendation would yield this sense.

16. foul: the marg. 'red' is better, though this scarcely brings out the full force of the word; his face is inflamed, we might translate 'flaming red is my face.' The weeping is caused by his losses, his pains, the unkindness of his friends, the enmity of God, though it may be added that it is one of the symptoms of elephantiasis. He feels, as the second line intimates, that death is closing in upon him.

17. His cruel fate has come upon him in spite of his innocence; cf. x. 7. We have a striking parallel in the fourth Servant-passage, Isa. liii. 9, 'Although he had done no violence,' and there is a parallel in the second line, with the clause 'and deceit was not in his mouth,' though less close. On which side dependence, if there is any, lies, is a question that cannot be settled by comparison of the two passages, but naturally depends for its answer on the general view taken of the dates of Job and the Servant poems. It is noteworthy that Job here makes no claim to sinlessness, noteworthy for its bearing on the identification of the Servant. In this verse Job contradicts the charge of Eliphaz in xv. 4, 5, perhaps also he repels what he felt to be the covert accusation in the concluding portion of his speech.

18. This picture of God's furious and persistent attacks upon him, so cruel, so undeserved, and his pitiful description of the sad extremities to which he is reduced, kindle his flaming indignation and wring from him a thrilling, passionate appeal against the injustice of his fate. The shadow of death is gathering on his eyes, there is no hope of recovery, he is to be done to death. Nothing is left then but a vindication of his fair fame for those who survive him. Hence he calls out to the earth not to cover his blood. It is a widely-spread superstition that blood spilt on

And let my cry have no *resting* place.
19 Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven,
And he that voucheth for me is on high.

---

the ground calls for vengeance on the murderer. Hence precautions were often taken to inflict death without bloodshed, or at least to prevent the blood from falling on the ground. Perhaps even the ecclesiastical appeal that the doomed heretic might be put to death without bloodshed, which seems only hateful hypocrisy since the tenderer death designed by the priests was at the stake, rested ultimately on some such superstition. But when blood had been shed the cry it uttered for vengeance (Gen. iv. 10; cf. Heb. xi. 4, xii. 24) might be stifled by covering it, or if the soil was porous the blood would sink in and gradually disappear. Hence Ezekiel, in the very striking passage xxiv. 7, 8, represents the blood shed by Jerusalem as poured out on the bare rock, so that it might not be covered with dust, 'that it might cause fury to come up to take vengeance.' Even after the earth had covered the blood it might again disclose it and thus secure the punishment of the guilty, 'the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain' (Isa. xxvi. 21). In Job's case there is no question of literal bloodshed, it is a very powerful expression of his demand that the wrong done him shall not be unredressed. Let his blood lie exposed, let its voice be unmuffled. The thought is developed in the second line. His cry is the cry of his blood, in which the soul resides, and Job desires that this cry shall have no resting-place. Just as when the body lies unburied the spirit wanders an unquiet ghost, finding no rest, so let his cry never cease to be uttered, wandering to and fro till it meets effective response. Like the importunate widow, or the elect who cry to God day and night, or the souls under the altar, the blood of Job will at last secure redress by its cry. Such importunity is a prophecy of success.

have no resting **place**: this gives the sense intended; the marg. 'have no more place' suggests a wrong idea.

19. Very fine is the transition from earth to heaven. Let earth not burke his case, for heaven will soon speak! When Job dies, and his blood cries for vengeance, as the cry moves through earth and heaven to find its answer, it will not fail of its quest. For even before Job dies, nay, even now as he speaks, his witness who will vindicate him is in heaven. He will not in His present estranged mood respond to Job; He has determined to slay him. But He will not remain always in this mood. And when the revulsion comes, and love wakes again in His breast, the cry of Job's blood as it smites on His ear will strike an echoing chord in His heart. He Himself will undertake the vindication of Job's

My friends scorn me: 20
But mine eye poureth out tears unto God;
That he would maintain the right of a man with God, 21

honour. In this life Job expects no mercy from God. Nor does he anticipate that after he is dead God will reverse the decree He has executed and recall him from Sheol. He will have gone beyond recall. He does not, even at this stage, express the hope that he will know of his vindication. All that he says now is that after his death God will vindicate him. His honour was his chief concern. God had branded him as a criminal; this was more intolerable than calamity or pain. At present to the world's eye all had gone; but honour and fair fame would at last be retrieved, and this was greater than all else. Job has all along asserted God's knowledge of his innocence, but that He acts in spite of it; now he attains the conviction that this knowledge will at length be suffered to come to its rights, and control God's attitude towards him. Cheyne emends the verse, 'Yes, I know it, my piercing cry is in heaven, And my shriek has entered the heights' (*EBi.* col. 2473).

20. Here again several emendations have been proposed. The first line is more literally 'My friends are my scorners.' But elsewhere, it is objected, the word means not 'scorner' but 'interpreter.' We have parallels, however, for this sense in Ps. cxix. 51; Prov. iii. 34. The line is short, but a simple remedy would be to read, as Budde suggests, 'scorners of their friend are my friends.' The LXX, followed by Siegfried and Beer, gives a different but inferior sense, attaching 'unto God' to the first line, 'My prayer would come unto God.' Duhm, by hints from the LXX and transposition of consonants, gets the sense 'So would be found for me my friend.' The second line is also altered by Siegfried and Beer in accordance with the LXX, though Duhm retains it as it is, in spite of Siegfried's dictum that no Hebrew could have so expressed himself. As the verse stands it is deeply moving. Mocked and betrayed by his friends, he lifts his face, all bathed in tears, to God. But he has only just complained of God as his bitter enemy, the implacable foe who has brought him to the gates of death. Yet to whom can the baffled one turn, when all human help fails him and his burden is too hard to bear, but to God? The native instinct, crushed by God's cruelty, still springs irrepressibly to seek its satisfaction in Him. In its uttermost extremity the soul flies from man to God.

21. The paradox of Job's plea comes out even more sharply. For the antagonist against whom Job wishes God to right him is no other than God Himself. The defendant implores the plaintiff to be his judge. He has already lamented that there is no

And of a son of man with his neighbour!
22 For when a few years are come,
I shall go the way whence I shall not return.

---

daysman between them (ix. 33), now he utters the striking thought 'Let God Himself be his daysman.' There is no one who is God's equal, who can confront God and force Him to do justice—no one but God Himself. The logical incoherence of the position must not disguise from us its religious depth. There is here no adumbration of distinctions within the Godhead, such as are expressed in the doctrine of the Trinity. For the distinction which hovers before Job's mind is that of contradictory moods in the same Being. In so far as these moods are thought of as successive there is no logical incoherence, but Job advances from this to the thought of an anticipation in the present of the mood of the future. Just now God is Job's settled enemy, by and by He will be his friend. But Job feels that this future mood may modify God's present action, He being conscious even now that His temper towards Job will change, and suffering this knowledge to protect Him from going too far. The religious feeling that comes here to such strange expression may be illustrated by the beautiful saying from the Qur'an, 'There is no refuge from God but unto Him' (Sur. ix. 119). The translation in the marg., 'That one might plead for a man with God, as a son of man *pleadeth* for his neighbour,' is to be rejected.

son of man: since the construction is harsh, we should, with Ewald and many scholars, read 'And between a man and his neighbour,' or 'friend.' If we retain 'son of man' it is simply equivalent to 'man,' the parallelism compelling the poet to express the same idea in different language. There is none of the later apocalyptic or Messianic significance attaching to the term, such as we find in Daniel, Enoch, and the New Testament.

neighbour: the natural impression made by the line in itself is that Job wishes his cause to be maintained against Eliphaz, so that in the first line Job prays God to vindicate him against his unjust treatment by God, and in the second to vindicate him against the unjust judgement of men. The parallelism would rather require us to regard God as the friend, but perhaps this would be too daring.

22. He invokes God to grant him this posthumous vindication, for in a few years he will go to his eternal home. The thought is not that God should intervene speedily, since otherwise he will be dead and intervention will come too late. It is Job's settled conviction that God will not vindicate him during his lifetime. Accordingly the text must mean that Job does not delay his plea, since he will die in a few years' time, and will then be in no

My spirit is consumed, my days are extinct, 17
The grave is *ready* for me.

position to utter it. But this is rather strange. No difficulty is created by Job's expectation that he may live on for a few years, for his disease may have been a lingering one; if it was elephantiasis, sufferers from it sometimes live for ten or even twenty years. But it is strange that Job should give as a reason why he makes this appeal now that only a few years are left him. There is no urgency where years are at one's disposal. Moreover, in the next verse Job seems to speak as if he were at death's door. The **few years** cannot therefore be well harmonized with the context. We cannot escape from this by the supposition that they include the whole of Job's lifetime, for this unduly strains the language. The text is accordingly suspicious. The Hebrew means literally 'years of number,' i. e. 'few years' (cf. 'men of number,' i. e. 'few men,' Gen. xxxiv. 30). The word for 'number' is very like the word for 'mourning.' Lagarde suggested 'years of mourning,' but the period of mourning extended over days rather than years. If we point the first word differently, with G. Hoffmann, we get the sense 'For the mourning-women shall come.' Budde's objection—that the way Job will have to go is not the way of the corpse to the grave, but of the spirit to Sheol, and that this will be trodden before the mourning-women come—is not decisive. As we see from the story of Jairus's daughter, the mourners were ready to raise the wail the moment death occurred. And were it otherwise, why should a poet be tied down to the strict sequence of events? It is further doubtful if Budde is right in the assumption that the soul was supposed to go to Sheol immediately after death. The belief was rather that for three days it tarried near the body. The emendation gives a picturesque detail in keeping with the pathetic tone of the passage, and is much to be preferred to the present text. The fact that the O. T. uses other names for the professional mourning-women is not, as Beer thinks, a serious objection. Siegfried strikes out this and the following verse, as the shortness of life is irrelevant to the context. But this is hardly justified in any case, still less with an emended text.

xvii. **1.** This verse is closely connected with the preceding. There is no reason to alter the text to harmonize the expectation of speedy death with the reference to 'few years' in xvi. 22, when that reference has been eliminated. The three short lines are unusual, but the irregularity is here effective, the broken utterances expressing Job's mood. The third line, literally 'graves for me,' is, it is true, surprisingly curt. Several emendations of the verse have been proposed.

2 Surely there are mockers with me,
And mine eye abideth in their provocation.
3 Give now a pledge, be surety for me with thyself;
Who is there that will strike hands with me?
4 For thou hast hid their heart from understanding:
Therefore shalt thou not exalt *them*.

2. As Dillmann says, an obscure verse. **mockers** is properly 'mockery,' but an alteration in the pointing would give the sense 'mockers,' and thus supply a proper antecedent for **their** in the second line. The second line is almost unintelligible. The meaning is thought to be that Job has continually before him the provocation of the friends. One may well believe that the poet would have expressed this thought plainly had he meant it. Budde reads, 'And through their deceits my eyes fail.' Duhm, 'And on bitter things mine eye abideth.' No certainty is possible; the general sense seems to be that Job complains of the delusive hopes, held out by the friends, of return to health and prosperity.

3. Probably the first line should run simply, 'Deposit now a pledge for me with thyself.' The pledge is that God will vindicate him. God gives bail to God for Job, the creditor becomes the debtor's guarantor. The metaphor suggests a pledge to pay a debt, Job on the contrary would have God undertake to prove that no debt is due. The request, however, has meaning only if Job anticipated that God would retain His animosity to him for some time to come. A pledge to act implies that action does not take place immediately. Job expects to die under God's ban. But before he dies, he wishes above all things to secure his future vindication, and therefore implores God to deposit now the pledge which will guarantee His effective justification of Job in the future. The passage is important as helping to fix the sense of passages more ambiguous, and as showing that Job has no hope for his character to be cleared till after death. For the singular dichotomy in God here postulated, see note on xvi. 21. Just as in Heb. vi. 13-18 God, because He can find none greater to give sanctity to His oath, makes Himself the third party, so to speak, by whom He swears, so here, since no other can meet God on equal terms, Job beseeches God to play at the same time these contradictory parts.

strike hands: the symbolical action by which a pledge was undertaken. Who else but God can give such a pledge as God would require?

4. The sense seems to be, 'Who else but God? For thou hast deprived the friends of understanding.' And since they are thus proved to be wanting in intelligence, God will not give them the

He that denounceth his friends for a prey, 5
Even the eyes of his children shall fail.
He hath made me also a byword of the people; 6
And I am become an open abhorring.

---

victory over Job. The verse is omitted in the LXX, and is struck out by Bickell and Duhm. The thought springs from point to point rather rapidly.

5. A very difficult verse, for which numerous explanations have been proposed. Siegfried considers the text of the first line to be mutilated, and does not attempt a restoration. The R.V. translation seems to be a threat to the friends that their denunciation of Job will be punished by the suffering of their children. A threat is not quite in place, though in this context such an objection must not be pressed. A better sense is obtained if we translate, 'They give up friends for a prey, while the eyes of their children fail;' i.e. 'They basely betray their friend, and reck nothing of the misery they bring on the children, thus deprived of their natural sustainer.' Since, however, the Hebrew gives **his children,** not 'their children,' it is difficult to suppose that the children are the children of the 'friends.' The translation 'give up' may be defended, though Ley prefers to make a small change, by which he gets the sense 'cause to wander' (*yānīd* for *yaggīd*). It is best, however, to take the verb to mean 'invite,' and translate 'One invites friends to partake, while his children's eyes fail;' i.e. He keeps open house, and lets his own children starve. Job is quoting a popular proverb. The friends have no understanding, but they invite Job to partake of their wisdom, while they have not enough wisdom to supply their own needs at home. Duhm explains as R.V., but takes the verse to be a marginal quotation. The word translated **prey** is literally 'portion.' If we point it as a verb, 'to partake,' the verse becomes easier.

6. We might translate 'I am made,' taking the verb as impersonal. **He hath made** is difficult, since God in this context is not referred to in the third person. Some read 'Thou hast made.' **people** is properly 'peoples,' and the meaning is that the news of Job's misfortunes, quickly spreading among the tribes, to whom the fame of his prosperity and integrity had been known, has made him a byword.

an open abhorring: marg. 'one in whose face they spit.' The Hebrew is strange, and the word supposed to mean 'spitting' is *tōpheth*, but elsewhere this is used of the place where Moloch was worshipped in Jerusalem. We may best read *mōphēth*, and with another slight alteration get the sense 'And I am become a portent before them.'

7 Mine eye also is dim by reason of sorrow,
And all my members are as a shadow.
8 Upright men shall be astonied at this,
And the innocent shall stir up himself against the godless.
9 Yet shall the righteous hold on his way,
And he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and stronger.
10 But return ye, all of you, and come now:
And I shall not find a wise man among you.

---

7. His constant weeping has made him almost blind, and his limbs are reduced to a shadow. The word translated **members** occurs only here. The line may carry on the thought of the preceding line, his eyes are so dim that the objects he sees flit before them like shadows.

8, 9. The upright will be so amazed at Job's calamity that they will rouse themselves against the godless; but in spite of the perversity of the moral government of the universe the righteous holds on his way and grows ever stronger. Davidson says, 'the passage is perhaps the most surprising and lofty in the book.' It is so surprising, in fact, that it is very difficult to believe that it could have been uttered by Job. The present writer had independently come to the conclusion that verse 9, and probably verse 8, could not have been uttered by Job, when he found that Duhm also cannot bring himself to believe that either of the verses belong to Job's speech. He thinks that, with the first line of verse 10, they are part of Bildad's speech, and should be inserted between xviii. 3 and xviii. 4. They do not suit badly there, and the first line of xviii. 4 thus gets a parallel in the emended first line of xvii. 10. The second line of xvii. 10 has then to be struck out, the insertion of it being required to adapt the displaced verses to their new context. In any case verses 8, 9, or verses 8–10, can go out without being missed, since verse 7 connects well with verse 10, or verse 11, better perhaps with the latter. To lighten the difficulty of verse 8 Merx proposed to transpose the two nouns in the second line, reading, 'And the godless shall stir up himself against the innocent.' This course is favoured by Dillmann and Beer, but rejected by Budde. It seems desirable if the verses are kept in their present context.

10. If this verse is in its original position, Job tells the friends to repeat their arguments if they like, but they will only stand convicted of folly by doing so. The first line is too long, and the

My days are past, my purposes are broken off, 11
Even the thoughts of my heart.
They change the night into day: 12
The light, *say they*, is near unto the darkness.

---

word translated **all of you** has a third not a second person suffix, and is strangely pointed with the same points as the preceding word. Since it differs from it only by one letter, it has probably arisen through dittography. The elimination of it brings the line to a normal length. If we place the line before xviii. 4, we must of course read the singular. By **return** Job does not mean that his friends show signs of leaving him. The meaning is 'repeat your arguments, return to the assault.'

11. We have here three short clauses, where we expect two parallel lines of normal length. Further, the word translated 'purposes' is elsewhere always used in a bad sense, and the plural nowhere else occurs. The word translated 'thoughts' is said in the marg. to mean 'possessions,' and this is the usual view, though Dillmann and Duhm think it means 'wishes.' Numerous suggestions have been made. G. H. B. Wright reads, 'My days have exceeded my allotted time, The cords of my heart are broken.' Budde, 'My days pass on to death, The cords of my heart are broken.' In the correction 'cords' they follow the LXX. Duhm reads, 'My days pass away without hope, They destroy the wishes of my heart.' The general sense is fortunately clear, beyond this we cannot get. Siegfried regards verses 11–16 as a late interpolation.

12. This verse is even more difficult. Siegfried leaves a blank instead of the second line, saying, 'This hemistich is entirely without sense or coherence.' The first line seems to mean that the friends wish to make out that night is day, i.e. that Job may expect speedy recovery instead of death. The second line, as translated in R. V., seems to express the thought that the darkness of Job's present condition will soon give way to light, as we say, 'the darkest hour is before the dawn.' For **unto** the marg. gives 'because of,' which is a more justifiable rendering. Literally the word means either 'from the face of' or 'than the face of.' Neither yields a good sense. Ley alters the preposition, and reads 'A near day out of manifest darkness.' Duhm reads, 'The night I make into day, And light is darkness before me.' This gives a good connexion with the context. We should perhaps, however, prefer Budde's method, which is simply that of a redivision of the consonants in the second line, without emendation. We thus get the sense 'The light of their friend should indeed not become dark.'

13 If I look for Sheol as mine house;
If I have spread my couch in the darkness;
14 If I have said to corruption, Thou art my father;
To the worm, *Thou art* my mother, and my sister;
15 Where then is my hope?
And as for my hope, who shall see it?
16 It shall go down to the bars of Sheol,
When once there is rest in the dust.

---

13. The marg. reads, 'If I hope, Sheol is mine house; I have spread my couch in the darkness; I have said to corruption ... and where now is my hope?' This gives a very striking sense. If Job hopes, his highest expectation is Sheol for his home, a couch in its darkness, the pit for his mother, the worm for his sister. But what kind of 'hope' is that? The R.V. translation also gives a good though a less striking sense: If Job has made up his mind to Sheol and the grave, where is the hope of which his friends chatter?

14. corruption: this rendering rests on an improbable derivation. We should translate 'pit' as in the marg.

Thou art my father: since the word for 'pit' is feminine, this clause is strange, moreover in the parallel clause we have two nouns against one here. It is a plausible suggestion that the text ran originally, 'I said to the pit, "my mother," and to the worm, "my sister."' Then a reader, thinking to give greater completeness to the passage, added the words, 'Thou art my father.' Job reckons himself the near kinsman of the grave and the worm.

15. as for my hope: the repetition is curious. The LXX gives 'my good' for 'my hope,' and this is adopted by several scholars.

16. to the bars: this is the usual translation. But this meaning is ill-attested, and if 'bars' are here put for 'gates,' why should not 'gates' have been said? Even Dillmann admits that the text is corrupt. The LXX reads 'with me,' and is followed in this by several scholars. The translation **when once** is also dubious. Generally the word means 'together.' Budde transfers it to the first line in place of the word rendered 'bars,' and in the second line inserts 'surely' in the vacant place; he thinks it fell out through its similarity to the preceding word. Thus we get the translation, 'Together they go down to Sheol; where in truth there is rest in the dust.' We might, with the LXX, take the verse as a question, and translate the verb in the

Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said, 18

second line 'descend' (so Hitzig and Duhm). 'Shall they go down with me to Sheol, Shall we together go down to the dust?' This is perhaps the best view. We might also adopt the translation 'descend,' but make the verse a statement rather than a question (so several scholars).

In these two chapters, the text of which is unusually corrupt and the movement of thought often hard to follow, Job makes one great step forward. In his first speech in the debate he had uttered the thought that God would seek His servant in love, when he had gone beyond recall (vii. 8, 21), and the thought is repeated in the third speech (xiv. 15–17). In the latter passage he utters the wish that God might hide him in Sheol out of the reach of His wrath, and then, when it had spent itself, remember and summon him to renew the old relations. The stress in these passages is on the satisfaction of God's need for fellowship with His servant. Fascinated as he is by the thought, though he fully believes that God will feel this need, Job sets it definitely aside. He is going to Sheol, and from Sheol there is no return. Job's unsatisfied longing for God will be avenged by God's unsatisfied longing for Job. In the present speech Job leaves this aspect of the case out of account. He is going to Sheol, and that places between him and God an impassable gulf. But when he dies he leaves his fame behind him. And this fame is now smirched with the foul stain that God's unrighteous treatment of him has fixed upon it. It is the thought of his reputation that now troubles him, and leads to the passionate appeal to earth not to cover his blood. And the feeling that it is intolerable that justice should not be done him before the eyes of men inspires him with the new conviction that God will see him righted before the world. For himself he has ceased to expect anything, but he reaches the assurance that his fair fame will be cleared. At present he has not taken the further step of believing that he shall himself know of his vindication. According to the view of Sheol, expressed in several passages of the O. T. as well as in this book, its inhabitants in their shadowy existence were cut off from God and earthly life. Therefore Job has to die, with his honour tarnished, and cheered only by the moral postulate that God must some time or other vindicate him. But as yet he does not dare to think of himself as knowing in Sheol whether he has been righted before men or not. The feeling is much the same as that which prompted Dido's famous words, 'Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.'

xviii. 1–4. Bildad asks why Job should treat the friends so

2 How long will ye lay snares for words?

contemptuously; does he imagine in his rage that the order of the world will be deranged for his sake?

xviii. 5-21. The light of the wicked shall be put out; he is caught in a snare; affrighted by terrors, his strength is consumed; he shall be destroyed and his house made accursed, his memory shall perish, his posterity be cut off, while men are struck with horror at his fate. Such is the doom of the unrighteous.

2. The plural 'ye' addressed to Job is surprising, for Job is not to be thought of as a collective, as if he stood for the nation, nor are we to suppose that Bildad includes those among the listeners (if there were any) who have sided with Job, especially when Job has so bitterly complained of his complete isolation. Nor will the view that Job makes himself one with all other righteous victims of oppression suffice to explain the plural, where the reference is simply to Job's own speech. It is much simpler to correct the plural second person into the singular with the LXX. No doubt it is easier to explain how the plural was changed into the singular than to account for the singular being changed into an inappropriate plural. But the canon that the more difficult reading should be preferred has not an unlimited range of application. A difficult reading may be due to sheer carelessness, to stupidity, to misplaced subtlety, or to some accident.

snares. This word occurs nowhere else, and its sense is conjectured from Arabic. If the translation is correct the meaning seems to be that Job hunts for words in which to express his thoughts; he strains after a subtle dialectic, but after all it is mere words without substance. The reference to **words** recalls the earlier reproaches that Job's language was simply windy speech; the reference to hunting retorts on Job his own charge that the friends' speeches were artificial rhetoric. It is a singularly inappropriate charge, for whatever Job's speeches were, they did not consist of subtle, far-fetched sophistries, but gushed hot from his heart. The traditional interpretation of the word is not 'snares,' but 'end.' We should, however, to get this sense correct the text, with several scholars (reading *qēts* for *qintsē*), rather than translate the present text in this way. But then we are confronted by a further difficulty. 'How long wilt thou make an end of words?' is utterly inappropriate, and the words can hardly mean as the A. V. translated them, 'How long *will it be ere* you make an end of words?' Accordingly we should have to follow Duhm and strike out **How long** as introduced from xix. 2, the beginning of the next speech. The line, it is true, is rather long, but in view of the rather large alteration required if we translate 'end,'

Consider, and afterwards we will speak.
Wherefore are we counted as beasts, 3
And are become unclean in your sight?
Thou that tearest thyself in thine anger, 4
Shall the earth be forsaken for thee?
Or shall the rock be removed out of its place?

---

it is perhaps better to retain the present word and translate as R. V.

Consider, and afterwards we will speak. Job had charged the friends with lack of understanding. Bildad flings back the reproach. But we should rather have expected 'consider, and then speak,' as we should say, 'think, before you speak,' or 'be quiet, and we will speak.' Siegfried thinks two readings have been fused together. **Afterwards** is also a little strange in the present text. Siegfried and Duhm substitute different forms of the pronoun 'we.' It would be better probably to change the first person plural into the second singular, 'Consider, and afterwards speak.' The exhortation to 'consider' is not opposed to the charge of hunting words in the previous clause. If Job would only give as much pains to think deeply as he does to spinning rhetorical sophistries, then he might speak with a better right.

3. Bildad resents Job's contemptuous treatment of the friends, as if they had no more intelligence than cattle (cf. Ps. lxxiii. 22).

unclean. This translation is retained by some scholars, but usually the word is thought to mean 'stupid.'

4. Before this verse Duhm inserts xvii. 8, 9 and the first line of 10. See note on that passage. Job had charged God with tearing him in His anger, Bildad replies that it is Job who tears himself in his anger against God. The Hebrew expresses the thought here in the third person. The second and third lines ask Job if the world is to be turned upside down for him. The earth is designed to be replenished by man, is that purpose to be thwarted that Job's interests may be served? The rock is firmly fixed in its place, is it to be overturned for him? Bildad hits one of Job's failings as a sufferer, he was self-centred, though not an egoist by nature. The third line quotes xiv. 18; cf. ix. 5. Marshall very ingeniously connects with Job's cry to the earth not to cover his blood, 'That would make the place sacrosanct, a perpetual desolation . . . A tabooed rock would need to be quarried away to an unclean place before the field could be cleansed.' The difficulties in the way of this acute suggestion are that the language seems to contemplate a general desolation of the earth, whereas the blood of Job would defile only a limited

5 Yea, the light of the wicked shall be put out,
And the spark of his fire shall not shine.
6 The light shall be dark in his tent,
And his lamp above him shall be put out.
7 The steps of his strength shall be straitened
And his own counsel shall cast him down.
8 For he is cast into a net by his own feet,
And he walketh upon the toils.
9 A gin shall take *him* by the heel,
And a snare shall lay hold on him.

---

area; that no reference is made to 'the rock' in xvi. 18; that the third line should refer to a convulsion of nature rather than the act of man, according to its meaning in xiv. 18; and that the links of connexion with xvi. 18 are too subtle to make it likely that this was in the author's mind.

5. Cf. xxi. 17. **light** is a symbol of prosperity and happiness. For **spark** the marg. 'flame' would be better. The metaphors in the two lines have the same meaning. It would, of course, be possible to take the language in a literal sense, in which case it depicts the desolation of his home.

6. his lamp above him. The lamp which hangs from the roof of the tent.

7. A new metaphor, not, as some think, a continuation of the preceding, describing his cautious movement made necessary by the failure of his light. Cf. Prov. iv. 12, and for the enlarging of the steps, to give free movement, Ps. xviii. 36.

steps of his strength. The confident swinging stride which he takes in his manly vigour. The curtailing of his steps symbolizes that adversity is come upon him.

cast him down. This sense of the word is unusual. The LXX, followed by several scholars, reads 'cause him to stumble.' which requires the transposition of two consonants. His evil designs bring about his own ruin.

8. His evil walk brings him into the net. The **toils** in the second line are the lattice-work placed over a pit to conceal it. The wild beast walks on it, it gives way beneath his feet, and he is trapped, a vivid metaphor for the unsuspecting confidence out of which the sinner is launched into ruin.

9. It is remarkable how many words for 'trap' Bildad contrives to heap together, as if to suggest that the world is full of traps to catch the feet that stray from the right path.

A noose is hid for him in the ground, 10
And a trap for him in the way.
Terrors shall make him afraid on every side, 11
And shall chase him at his heels.
His strength shall be hungerbitten, 12
And calamity shall be ready for his halting.
It shall devour the members of his body, 13
Yea, the firstborn of death shall devour his members.

---

11. And now he is harried by terrors, which close in upon him from every side. The hell-hounds are hard at his heels, yet as he seeks in mad distraction to escape from these it can only be by rushing to meet others as ghastly, while all about him his way is thickly sown with snares.

chase him. If this translation can be accepted, the sense obtained is excellent. Many emendations have been proposed, Siegfried does not attempt emendation, but leaves a blank in the text. For terrors on every side we may compare Magor-missabib, the name given by Jeremiah to Pashhur (Jer. xx. 3, 4) to express the terrors that would encompass him, also Jer. xx. 10.

12. The metaphor in the first line seems to be that his vigour is exhausted by hunger. But more probably the word translated **his strength** should be rendered 'his disaster,' which gives a parallel to **calamity** in the next line. 'Hungry shall be his disaster,' i. e. the disaster which is to seize him is hungry for its prey. If the expression be thought too curt, we could read 'disaster shall be hungry for him.'

for his halting: marg. 'at his side'; commentators are divided in their preferences.

13. the firstborn of death is generally thought to be death in its most terrible form, and to mean elephantiasis. The reference to the devouring of his members suits the ravages of disease. This, however, is by no means universally accepted. Marshall thinks it is the worm of corruption that is meant. He compares 'the worm shall feed sweetly on him' xxiv. 20, and we might also compare xvii. 14. Ley argues that since death is called 'the king of terrors' in the next verse, the firstborn of death must be the terrors that accompany death. In that case we have a further development of the thought in verse 11. But could these terrors be said to devour his members? Ewald and others think the firstborn of death is one doomed to death, for which we may compare the similar term 'a son of death.' In that case the connexion is, the wicked shall be so ravenous from hunger that he shall devour his own flesh; for which we should have a striking parallel in

14 He shall be rooted out of his tent wherein he trusteth;
And he shall be brought to the king of terrors.

Isa. ix. 20, 'they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm.' The verse raises further difficulties. In the Hebrew the two lines begin with practically the same two words, this suggests that the text may have been assimilated, or that we have to do with variant forms of the same line. Moreover, the phrase translated **the members of his body** is strange. The margin says that the Hebrew means 'bars of his skin,' and what that means is far from clear; Marshall thinks of 'the skeleton, especially the ribs visible through the skin.' More generally it is thought to be 'pieces of his skin,' 'pieces' are then explained as 'members' and 'skin' as put for the whole body, which is rather violent treatment of the language. Duhm gets over the difficulty by supposing the two lines to be variants of which the second should be preferred. He translates, 'the firstborn of death devours his members.' This, however, leaves a parallel line to be found, and he finds it in the second line of verse 14, which involves the striking out of the first line. It is much more satisfactory to correct very slightly the text of the first line with Wright, Beer, and Budde and get the sense, 'By sickness his skin is devoured.' If this is correct, the meaning of the firstborn of death is fixed as the sickness referred to. We ought perhaps not to insist on defining it further than as fatal sickness, to argue that Bildad must mean the disease from which Job is suffering is to make the allusion to Job far too pointed. The lurid picture in this chapter is not simply a mirror in which Job is to see himself. It is still only a general description that we have, at the most with features introduced recalling Job's case, though this is by no means clear. It remains to mention that Siegfried reads for the second line 'death gnaws at his splendour,' and eliminates the first line as a gloss, made when the second line had been corrupted into its present unintelligible form. Klostermann instead of 'firstborn of death' reads the two words translated in Ps. xci. 3 'the noisome pestilence.'

14. The first line is literally, 'He shall be rooted out of his tent, his confidence,' the sense being that given in R. V. Some translate, 'His confidence shall be rooted out of his tent,' explaining 'his confidence' as his possessions, children, &c. But the order would probably have been different. Siegfried and Budde suspect that some other word than 'confidence' originally stood in the text.

he shall be brought: Heb. 'it shall (or thou shalt) bring him.' The subject is unnamed, 'it shall' is preferable to 'Thou' (i. e. God) 'shalt.'

the king of terrors is Death as ruler in the kingdom of the

There shall dwell in his tent that which is none of his: 15
Brimstone shall be scattered upon his habitation.
His roots shall be dried up beneath, 16
And above shall his branch be cut off.
His remembrance shall perish from the earth, 17
And he shall have no name in the street.
He shall be driven from light into darkness, 18
And chased out of the world.

---

dead. Siegfried leaves a blank for the rest of the verse after 'his tent.'

15. that which is none of his. If the text is correct, this is the meaning, but the Hebrew is strange. Siegfried leaves a blank in place of the words. Beer and Voigt most ingeniously read 'Lilith shall dwell in his tent.' Lilith is a night-demon of the vampire type, supposed, with other uncanny creatures, to haunt ruins. She is mentioned in Isa. xxxiv. 14, where the R. V. text translates 'night-monster,' but has fortunately placed 'Lilith' in the margin. Duhm gives a rather easier emendation.

Brimstone. Generally it is thought that there is an allusion to the fate of the Cities of the Plain, and that the brimstone is showered on the habitation from heaven. There might have been a custom of scattering brimstone on an accursed place, as salt was scattered; cf. Judges ix. 45; Deut. xxix. 23; Isa. xxxiv. 9. It is questionable whether there is any allusion here to Job's calamity. There is no mention of brimstone in the account of the 'fire of God' falling from heaven. This was the lightning, not fire and brimstone, moreover it did not fall on Job's habitation, but on the sheep.

16. Cf. Amos ii. 9. His family is destroyed, root and branch. Budde omits the verse on the ground that it comes too late in the passage and deranges the sequence of metaphors. For **cut off** the marg. 'wither' is preferable.

17. For **earth** it would be better to substitute 'land.' The word translated **street** means a place outside. Here it is difficult to translate. In verse 10 the word is rendered 'fields.' The reference is apparently to scattered homesteads in remote districts. Neither in the more crowded haunts of men, nor in the sparsely peopled districts, where memory is more tenacious because the competition of interests is less keen, will any recollection of him linger.

18. The verbs in the Hebrew are plural, the R.V. gives the sense. Duhm would prefer to point in the singular and take God as the subject. From the light of day he is chased into Sheol.

19 He shall have neither son nor son's son among his people,
Nor any remaining where he sojourned.
20 They that come after shall be astonied at his day,
As they that went before were affrighted.
21 Surely such are the dwellings of the unrighteous,
And this is the place of him that knoweth not God.

---

19. His posterity shall be extirpated. Instead of **remaining** we might better translate 'escaped one.' The words **where he sojourned** are literally 'in his sojournings.' Generally it is thought that the reference is to his own home. But the meaning may be in the home of friends with whom he occasionally stayed; none of his children would escape to take refuge with friends.

20. The translation in R.V. may mean that later generations, as well as the earlier generations, that lived after the catastrophe will be horror-struck by it. But this is in direct contradiction to the previous statements that the very memory of the wicked man should perish. The difficulty is only partially removed if we suppose **they that went before** to be his contemporaries. The natural impression made by the translation is that both his predecessors and successors will be amazed at his fate. Then we should have to conclude with Budde that his predecessors are thus astonished when he joins them in Sheol, just as the shades were astounded to see the King of Babylon (Isa. xiv. 9, 10). This, however, does not remove the difficulty caused by the reference to his successors. Accordingly it is best to translate as in the margin, though the words do not elsewhere occur in this sense, 'They that dwell in the west are astonied at his day, as they that dwell in the east are affrighted.' The literal rendering of **are affrighted** is 'laid hold on horror.' The verse means that when his day, i. e. his judgement, comes it provokes universal astonishment.

It is by no means clear that in this lurid picture of the wicked man and his fate Bildad intended Job to see the reflection of his own case. The grounds on which this is alleged by commentators are much too flimsy to sustain it. Where they suit Job's case the features are general and conventional, of specific features such as 'the firstborn of death' or 'brimstone' the former may not, the latter does not, suit Job. The speech says nothing new, except in expression. Quite apart from Job's own case, it was relevant for the friends to meet his assertions of the prosperity of the wicked with counter assertions. So far as Job himself might be wicked, the principles they affirmed applied to him. But there

Then Job answered and said, 19
How long will ye vex my soul, 2
And break me in pieces with words?
These ten times have ye reproached me: 3
Ye are not ashamed that ye deal hardly with me.
And be it indeed that I have erred, 4
Mine error remaineth with myself.

---

is nothing to show that they modelled their descriptions on his calamities. On the other hand, Ley's view that both Job and Bildad unite in depicting the conditions of their own time, Job describing the misery into which Nebuchadnezzar has brought the Jews, while Bildad predicts the fate that will overtake him, is far-fetched. The evils of the author's time no doubt colour some of the speeches, but more than this we cannot rightly discover.

xix. 1-6. Job remonstrates with the friends for persisting in their unkind criticism. Even had he erred his sin would not affect them. But it is God who has subverted his right.

xix. 7-12. Vainly he cries for help, God has hemmed him in, and assaults him violently.

xix. 13-19. All his friends, even his family and servants, have forsaken him.

xix. 20-22. In his dire extremity he appeals to the friends for pity.

xix. 23-29. Would that his protestations might be written, might be graven for ever in the rock. But he knows that his Vindicator lives, and will take up his cause on his grave, and though he must die, yet without his flesh he will see God, no longer estranged—an overpowering thought! Let his friends remember the judgement of God, and persecute him no more.

3. ten times, used for 'several times,' as in Jacob's complaint to Laban, 'Thou hast changed my wages ten times,' Gen. xxxi. 41.

deal hardly. The word is of uncertain meaning. It does not occur elsewhere, except possibly in Isa. iii. 9. Probably the R.V. translation comes near the sense. Numerous emendations have been proposed.

4. Job does not admit that he had erred, though the Hebrew would bear this meaning, for this is just what he will not, and indeed at this stage cannot, admit. He accepts the friends' view for the sake of argument. Granted that he had sinned, his error remained with himself. The meaning of the second line is much

5 If indeed ye will magnify yourselves against me,
And plead against me my reproach:
6 Know now that God hath subverted me *in my cause*,
And hath compassed me with his net.
7 Behold, I cry out of wrong, but I am not heard:
I cry for help, but there is no judgement.
8 He hath fenced up my way that I cannot pass,
And hath set darkness in my paths.

---

disputed. We may explain, My sin is my own concern, it is not your business; or, My sin hurts no one but myself, it does not injure you; or, it is something which I alone can know, you have nothing but inference, guess-work, to go upon. Any one of these Job might have said. Probably we should adopt the second view, on account of the parallel in vii. 20, 'If I have sinned, what do I unto thee, O thou watcher of men?' As there Job means that his sin, even granted he had committed it, cannot hurt God, so here he means that it cannot hurt the friends. It is unnecessary, with Duhm, to make the verse a question.

5. The marg. translates as a question, 'Will ye indeed magnify yourselves against me, And plead against me my reproach?' This is adopted by several of the best authorities, and follows very well on verse 4. According to the R. V. the sentence begun in this verse is completed in verse 6. If you cast my calamity in my teeth, and assume airs of superiority on the basis of it, then let me tell you that it is due to no fault of mine, but God alone is to blame. We might also translate, 'If indeed ye will magnify yourselves against me, then prove against me my reproach;' if you adopt this attitude, you ought to justify it by sound arguments!

6. It is God who by the disasters He has brought on him has put him in the wrong. And with reference to Bildad's statement that the wicked 'is cast into a net by his own feet,' he replies that his own evil walk had not snared him in his present misery, but God had cast the toils around him.

subverted me: to be preferred to the marg. 'overthrown me.'

7. If he appeals for justice God refuses to listen and right him; cf. Lam. iii. 8.

cry out of wrong. Better, 'cry out, Violence!' cf. Jer. xx. 8; Hab. i. 2.

8. All way of escape is cut off, for God has built a wall athwart his path. Cf. Lam. iii. 7, 9; Hos. ii. 6. Job had expressed himself similarly iii. 23, xiii. 27, xiv. 5. Another metaphor illustrates his state, darkness has gathered about him so dense that he is utterly bewildered and cannot see a step of his way.

He hath stripped me of my glory, 9
And taken the crown from my head.
He hath broken me down on every side, and I am gone: 10
And mine hope hath he plucked up like a tree.
He hath also kindled his wrath against me, 11
And he counteth me unto him as *one of* his adversaries.
His troops come on together, and cast up their way against me, 12
And encamp round about my tent.
He hath put my brethren far from me, 13
And mine acquaintance are wholly estranged from me.
My kinsfolk have failed, 14
And my familiar friends have forgotten me.
They that dwell in mine house, and my maids, count me for a stranger: 15

---

9. The crown is all that gave him honour in the eyes of men, his wealth and high standing in society, but especially his righteousness; cf. 'my justice was as a robe and a diadem,' xxix. 14; Lam. v. 16.

10. God breaks him down like a building, so that he has to go. His hope of happiness God has extirpated, as a tree is plucked up by the roots.

11. The metaphor changes to a military one, as in x. 17, xvi. 12-14.

12. cast up their way: throw up a rampart, from which to attack the fortress. The mention of the tent in this context is not quite what would have been expected.

13. The next sign of God's hostility that he mentions is abandonment by his friends, his relatives, and those of his own household. Many scholars, however, follow the LXX, and in the first line read, 'My brethren are gone far from me.'

14. familiar friends: they that know me. Some connect this word with the preceding line, and then complete the second line with the first two words of verse 15 translated 'They that dwell in mine house.' If we adopt this course, which produces lines of more normal length (they are too short in this verse, and the first line of verse 15 is too long), it would be best to read, with Duhm, 'My kinsfolk have ceased to know me,' which involves the omission of one consonant (*middē'i* for *mᵉyuddā'i*). This gives an excellent parallel to the next line.

15. They that dwell in mine house. Frequently explained

I am an alien in their sight.
16 I call unto my servant, and he giveth me no answer,
Though I entreat him with my mouth.
17 My breath is strange to my wife,
And my supplication to the children of my *mother's*
womb.

---

as including slaves and hired labourers. But the words properly mean 'the sojourners in mine house,' and may better refer to guests who occasionally stayed with Job. Connecting with verse 14, we may translate, 'And my guests have forgotten me.' The next couplet then runs **my maids count me for a stranger, I am an alien in their sight.**

16. Whether any definite slave is intended, the house-steward, or Job's personal attendant, is not clear. We might translate the second line, 'I have to entreat him with my mouth.' He must humiliate himself by entreaty, since the servant, once so obsequious, pays no heed to his command.

17. strange is explained as 'offensive,' but perhaps it is not the verb 'to be strange' that is used here, but as the Oxf. Heb. Lexicon, followed by Budde, takes it, another verb meaning 'to be loathsome,' cognate to an Arabic word with the same meaning.

my supplication: marg. 'I make supplication' or 'I am loathsome.' The parallelism is decisive for the latter; though here again appeal must be made to an Arabic verb. The translation 'I make supplication' takes the word as the Qal conjugation of a verb, which has just before (verse 16) been used in the Hithpael (reflexive). There is no other case, however, of the Qal being used in this sense. Moreover, the occurrence of the Hithpael just before makes it possible that here the original text has been accidentally altered. In any case the ill-odour exhaled by reason of his disease is intended.

of my mother's **womb:** marg. 'of my body.' The literal sense is 'of my womb.' For the expression used of a man see Mic. vi. 7 ('fruit of my womb'); Ps. cxxxii. 11 ('fruit of thy womb'). In both of these cases the R. V. translates 'body' as the marg. here. Deut. vii. 13, xxviii. 4 are not so clear. According to the Prologue, and references in the poem (viii. 4, xxix. 5), Job's children are all dead. If we translate as in the margin we must suppose they are children of Job's concubines; but ch. xxxi leaves the impression that he was not a polygamist, while the reference to his wife just before is an objection to the view that here he is speaking of the children of concubines; or we must suppose that the poet has forgotten the fate of the children, which

Even young children despise me; 18
If I arise, they speak against me.
All my inward friends abhor me: 19
And they whom I loved are turned against me.
My bone cleaveth to my skin and to my flesh, 20
And I am escaped with the skin of my teeth.

---

is very improbable, or we must suppose that grand-children are meant, which is most unlikely, for it unduly strains the language, and ch. i, while it does not explicitly exclude this possibility, yet virtually does so; it is surely assumed that Job's sons, while living in houses of their own, were not married. We may then set aside the translation 'of my body.' The translation in the text is also difficult. The words do not naturally bear the meaning put upon them. Moreover, Job has already mentioned his brothers in verse 13, though the term there used may have a less restricted meaning. A third suggestion is that the word translated 'womb,' like the cognate Arabic word, means here 'clan.' The phrase would then mean, 'the members of my clan.' This seems open to the objection that the verse in general, and the mention of his wife in particular, shows that Job is speaking of those who would naturally be in closer contact with him than the members of his clan. On this ground we should perhaps accept the R. V. and suppose the reference to be to his uterine brothers.

18. Cf. xxx. 1, 8–10. The very children laugh at the grotesque figure he cuts when he tries to get up and hobble about. Once the young had modestly retired from his presence, the old had risen to welcome him, and princes had been silent before him (xxix. 8–10, 21–25).

19. inward friends: *lit.* 'the men of my council,' i. e. his close friends, with whom he shared intimate, confidential relations.

20. This is a difficult and much debated verse. The first line seems to mean that he is worn to a skeleton. The most natural expression would be 'my skin hangs on my bones.' The reference to 'flesh' here seems out of place. It should probably be eliminated from the first line, and we should translate, 'my bone cleaves to my skin.' Some follow the LXX and read, 'my flesh is rotten in my skin,' but why add 'in my skin'? The second line has become a familiar proverb, but it is very difficult to know what is meant by the skin of the teeth. That it is a term for the gums, reduced to skin, and that the sense is, my gums alone remain untouched, might seem credible, if we were not reading the work of a great poet. If the text is sound the general meaning is probably that he has barely escaped, that he has escaped with the

21 Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends;
For the hand of God hath touched me.
22 Why do ye persecute me as God,
And are not satisfied with my flesh?
23 Oh that my words were now written!

---

loss of everything. But the precise sense is uncertain, possibly, since the teeth have no skin, the skin of the teeth is equivalent to nothing at all. The text is suspicious, since **skin** occurs twice in the verse. We have already seen that 'flesh' should be removed from the first line. It is therefore a plausible suggestion, adopted by several scholars, that it should be substituted for 'skin' in the second line, and that we should read, 'And I am escaped with my flesh in my teeth.' This is what we have already had in xiii. 14, 'I will take my flesh in my teeth' (see note).

21. Utterly broken by the sad recital of his woes, and feeling that God is his relentless enemy, the cause of all his misery, he turns to the friends to implore their compassion. It is with great art that the poet has introduced this fine transition. In itself the appeal is moving, but still more when we see the proud man, who has lashed his friends with scorn and anger, reduced to become a suppliant for their pity. An appeal all the more hopeless that the reason he urges is the very reason why the friends will not respond. How should God's sycophants succour him whom God has smitten? But the supreme art of the poet in placing it here lies in this, that it greatly heightens the effect of the wonderful passage that is to follow. From God he turns to man in his desperation, but man fails him, and in a burst of sublime confidence he returns from man to God.

touched, rather 'smitten.' This perhaps supports the view that Job's disease was elephantiasis, since leprosy was in a special sense regarded as a stroke of God. We may compare the description of the suffering Servant of Yahweh in Isa. liii. 4–9.

22. The friends follow Job with their animosity as relentlessly as God, and they seem as if they cannot slander him enough. To eat the flesh of any one is an Aramaic and Arabic expression for slandering him.

23. From his unpitying friends Job turns for vindication to posterity. They despise his tears and refuse to believe his solemn affirmation of innocence. From the cruel unbelief of the present he appeals to the verdict of history. If only his words could be written for later generations to read, to them he might trust his honour. They would read them, unblinded by the smoke of controversy, their passion uninflamed by its heat, and

Oh that they were inscribed in a book!
That with an iron pen and lead
They were graven in the rock for ever! 24

judge him truly. In view of the great declaration that is to follow in verses 25–27 the reader is naturally tempted to think that it is this which Job wishes to have written. But in that case verse 25 would hardly begin with a connective particle, linking it to its present context. Moreover, it is a fine thought that Job should be driven from the present to seek refuge in the future, before he finds his refuge in God.

inscribed in a book: Duhm divides the consonants differently, to the improvement of the style, and gets the sense 'inscribed in his book.' He thinks that with such overpowering anxiety to have his words written, Job could have written them down himself. Accordingly he takes the wish to be that they should be inscribed in God's book. We should then have the same schism in God implied as we have already met, though expressing itself in a different way. Since, however, God's book is inaccessible to men, he wishes (verse 24) that for them his words might be engraved in the everlasting rock. But the usual view that Job first wishes his words to be written in a book, and then, conscious how soon a book might perish, corrects himself and utters the desire that they might be graven for ever in the rock, seems more satisfactory. The natural impression is that Job has in the two verses the same object in view, and that they do not deal with a writing in heaven and also one on earth. Moreover, it rather spoils the impression of verses 25–27 if already in verse 23 Job expresses the wish for God to take action. It is trying Job's language by inappropriate canons to raise any difficulty about his desire to have his words written in a book. As the thought surges up within him, he utters it, not thinking to pass on himself the criticism, 'Well, why don't I write them myself?'

24. Possibly Job may refer to two kinds of writing, an inscription made with an iron stylus on a leaden tablet, and an inscription in the rock. The former were well-known to antiquity. This sense would be better expressed if the text were slightly altered. Perhaps the other view is to be preferred, that only one inscription is intended: he asks that his words should be cut in the rock with an iron stylus and then that molten lead should be poured into the characters to make them more legible and to preserve them from the ravages of wind and rain, so that for all time men might read his declaration of innocence. There is no evidence, however, that this practice was followed in antiquity.

25 But I know that my redeemer liveth,

xix. 25–27. But this record in the rocks is impracticable. Is he then never to be vindicated, in the present or the future? In a sudden burst of faith he utters the great conviction enshrined in these verses. Already he had expressed the remarkable assurance that his witness was in heaven, and He that vouched for him was on high. To this he returns. My friends fail me, the future will not right me, but I know that my Vindicator lives. He achieves in this passage a loftier flight than he has attained before. Unfortunately the interpretation, especially of verse 26, is much disputed, and the reference to Christ and the resurrection, which has obtained such wide currency in the Christian Church, has diffused very erroneous views of the passage. The general meaning is as follows: 'I know that my Vindicator even now lives, and after I am dead will rise up to attest my righteousness, and though my body is destroyed, yet I shall see God acting thus for me.' Some, however, and Budde and Kautzsch most recently, hold that there is no reference to any appearance of God after Job is dead, but that his vindication is to take place before his death. The language can be accommodated to this explanation, for the Hebrew is ambiguous, and this is what actually happens in the sequel. On the other hand the language favours the other view; moreover Job, in the parallel passage xvi. 18, 19, definitely contemplates vindication after death, 'Earth cover not my blood.' Budde argues that Job has most decisively set this hope aside in xiv. 14 ff. But had he done so there, this would not prove that he could not, in such a moment of exaltation, have passed from despair to hope. And there is nothing at all to prove that Job had moved from his earlier position. Sheol still remains the gloomy under-world, Job says nothing of escape from it. All that he says is that God will vindicate him, and he will see God in spite of his death. The hope of immortality is not expressed here, but only of a momentary vision of God, assuring him of his vindication. Even the thought of this overwhelms him.

25. But I know. The marg. renders 'For' instead of 'But.' In that case Job would be giving a reason for what has just preceded. Apparently this would involve our regarding the words that he wishes to have written as those in verses 25–27, a view that we have already set aside. The translation 'But' is much better; from the vain wishes of earth he soars to the radiant certainty of God. The pronoun in the Hebrew is emphatic. Men may doubt my integrity, but for my part I know without any misgivings that God will establish it.

my redeemer liveth. The word translated 'redeemer' is *gō'ēl*. The human *gō'ēl* was the next of kin, who had various duties to perform, imposed by his relationship, such as to redeem from

And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth:
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed, 26

bondage, or debt, and especially to avenge his kinsman's blood. Here, accordingly, several interpret the term to mean 'avenger of blood.' In favour of this view is the appeal to earth not to stifle the cry of his blood for vengeance (xvi. 18). On the other hand this passage says nothing of Job's unjust death, so that the suggestion of this sense is not given by the present context. Yahweh is also so often spoken of as the deliverer of Israel by the Second Isaiah, probably also in Ps. xxii. 8 (read with Halévy, His *gō'ēl* is Yahweh), that here also we should probably adopt a similar sense. Only we must not translate 'deliverer' or 'redeemer,' which would imply a more advanced doctrine of the future life than we find in Job, such a doctrine as we find in Pss. xvi, xvii, xlix and lxxiii. The marg. 'vindicator' is the sense required; it is not redemption from Sheol, but the clearing of his fame, to which Job looks forward. When further he says of his vindicator that he 'lives,' he hints the contrast with his own condition; he dies, but his vindicator is the living one. And life is not mere existence; the living God is the God who acts and thus manifests His life.

at the last. The word is probably adjectival rather than adverbial, meaning 'as one who comes after' or 'as one who comes at the end.' The meaning may be 'as one who comes in at the end of the dispute,' or 'one who comes as my successor when I am dead,' or possibly 'the Last' (as God is called 'the First and the Last,' Isa. xliv. 6, xlviii. 12). If the view is correct that Job contemplates vindication only after his death, then the translation 'as a successor' should probably be preferred. Siegfried reads 'my successor.' **Stand up** is literally 'arise.' The term is used of one who intervenes in a lawsuit as witness or judge.

upon the earth: the literal translation is 'upon the dust,' and we should in all probability adopt that rendering here, and explain it to mean, upon my grave. Bickell, Siegfried, and Klostermann read 'upon my dust.' The translation 'upon the earth' is dubious, though the phrase occurs in that sense in xli. 33. We can hardly, however, decide against it on the ground that it would be taken for granted, inasmuch as God might speak from heaven or upon earth. The rendering 'against the dust,' i. e. against the friends who are made of dust (iv. 19), is unlikely.

26. The verse is very difficult. The marg. gives two main alternatives, and, whichever of the three renderings be adopted, 'from' may be translated 'without.' The two marginal renderings are (*a*) 'And after my skin hath been destroyed, this *shall be*,

Yet from my flesh shall I see God:

---

even from my flesh shall I see God,' and (*b*) 'And *though* after my skin this *body* be destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God.' The literal translation of the first line is, 'And after my skin, they have destroyed, this.' The explanations are numerous. 'After' is apparently a preposition, so that 'after my skin' means, after its loss. The next clause may be taken as relative, the relative pronoun being, as often, omitted, 'which they have destroyed.' The third person plural active is frequently used in Hebrew when we should use a passive, so that we could render 'which has been destroyed.' 'This' may mean 'this skin of mine,' Job illustrating his words by a gesture pointing to his diseased skin. Or we might translate, 'And after my skin, this has been destroyed,' explaining as in the marg. (*b*), after my skin has been destroyed, this [i. e. my body] be destroyed as well. The marg. (*a*), which takes 'this' to mean 'this shall happen,' is also possible. If the text is correct, we should probably accept the first explanation, 'after the loss of this my skin, which has been destroyed.' The second line may bear quite opposite meanings. The word translated 'from' may mean 'without' or it may mean 'in,' since 'from' may mean 'away from,' or 'from the standpoint of.' If the general view of the passage that Job refers to an experience after death be correct, the translation 'without' must be adopted, and that not in the sense that he is reduced to a mere skeleton, all his flesh having been eaten away by his disease, but that he has died and become a disembodied spirit. The text of the verse is suspected by several scholars, and numerous emendations have been proposed. Ley makes a trifling change in the word translated 'my skin,' and ingeniously suggests that the word translated above 'they have destroyed' was originally a marginal gloss, indicating a lacuna in the text, caused by the rubbing out of the letters, and subsequently the word 'they are obliterated' [i. e. the letters] was taken into the text by mistake. The original sense he supposes may have been 'After I have ceased to be I shall know this.' Duhm emends the text by a new division of the consonants and very slight changes. He connects the last word of verse 25, 'shall arise,' with this verse. Thus he gets the sense 'And another shall arise as my witness, and shall set up his sign, Without my flesh shall I see God.' Siegfried takes 'the whole passage as a later gloss in which the resurrection of the just is regarded as a possibility (cf. Dan. xii. 13; 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11), contrary to the opinion put forth in the Book of Job with regard to Sheol' (ch. 3, &c). He also corrects the text and gains the sense that Job's *gō'ēl* will arise on his grave to defend him,

Whom I shall see for myself, 27
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another.
My reins are consumed within me.

---

will reanimate his body that had been destroyed by leprosy, and thus establish his righteousness. Probably, however, the passage does not contemplate a resurrection, and if the very difficult text has to be corrected, Duhm suggests a much better way of doing it.

shall I see God: here Job advances to a new conviction. He had previously asserted that his witness was in heaven, and looked forward to vindication by Him after his death. Now he expresses his confidence not only that his vindicator will act for him, but that he shall be permitted to see Him. His character will be cleared, but he will also know that it is cleared.

27. for myself: marg. 'on my side'; either translation gives a good sense. The stress laid in the passage on Job's seeing of God perhaps favours the former; three times Job asserts it, once with the pronoun emphatically introduced, 'I, yes I, shall see,' and in the next clause 'my eyes.' Job accumulates various forms of language to insist that he himself with his own eyes will see God. That he would see Him on His side did not need to be said, since God was to appear as his vindicator. What overwhelms him is the thought of his vision of God. It is no hearing of God by the hearing of the ear, no sight of God at second hand, but face to face he for himself will see God.

and not another: marg. 'and not *as* a stranger.' The words are ambiguous. Job may mean that he and no other will see God, or that he will see God and not another; the word translated 'another' means stranger, so that we might also translate 'mine eyes and not a stranger shall behold,' or as in the marg. 'mine eyes shall behold, and not *as* a stranger.' In favour of the former view is the fact that it makes Job's emphatic assertion that he himself shall see God more emphatic still. On the other hand the phrase 'mine eyes and not a stranger' is rather awkward. Besides, the vindication of Job is not communicated to himself alone, God must confess him before men. And the rival translation surely yields the finer sense. At present Job feels that his old familiar friend is estranged from him, but when this blessed vision breaks on his eyes, it will not be the God of the present who will appear to him, but the God who for so long had been his dear and intimate friend.

My reins are consumed within me. It is not clear whether Job means that he faints with longing, or that the thought of this vision of God overwhelms him. Probably the latter, for he does not expect the vindication till after his death. Orientals swoon

28 If ye say, How we will persecute him!
Seeing that the root of the matter is found in me;
29 Be ye afraid of the sword:
For wrath *bringeth* the punishments of the sword,
That ye may know there is a judgement.

---

from emotion much more readily than Westerns. The reader may recall several instances in *The Arabian Nights*. The 'reins' or kidneys are often mentioned in the O. T. as the seat of intense emotion. Klostermann points differently and gets the sense 'I am utterly consumed.'

28. The last two verses bring us back from heaven to earth. They are also difficult and probably corrupt. Job threatens the friends if they persist in their persecution of him. According to the present text of verse 28 the R. V. translation gives the probable sense, and we must explain **the root of the matter** to be an expression for sincerity. But it is more likely that, with several scholars, we should read with 'many ancient authorities' 'in him' instead of **in me**, and take the word translated **is found** as a first pers. plur. active. We thus get the sense 'If ye say, How we will persecute him And find the root of the matter in him.' The 'root of the matter' is in that case the cause of Job's suffering. They propose to push their scrutiny into Job's case till they detect the hidden mischief that lurks within him.

29. Their persecution of Job will bring punishment upon them. Ley, on the basis of the LXX, reads 'falsehood' instead of 'sword' in the first line. The second line is generally regarded as corrupt, and a large number of emendations have been put forward. The simplest would be that proposed by Gesenius, slightly to alter one letter and read 'these' for **wrath**, 'for these are sins deserving the sword,' but it is hardly satisfactory. Dillmann suggests 'for the sword avenges transgressions.' Duhm, 'for wrath will destroy the reprobate.' No certainty is attainable. The LXX reads 'for wrath will come upon the lawless.' The third line is also questionable, the text being improbable. We might read 'That ye may know the Almighty,' or 'That ye may know that there is a judge.'

It is not quite easy to see why the poet should have suffered Job to reach the conviction attained in xix. 25–27 so early in the debate, especially as it seems to exercise so slight an influence on his later speeches. It would not be wholly satisfactory to say that up to this point Job's question has been his personal relation to God, and now that has been settled it will henceforth be the problem of God's government of the world. For while the personal relation has hitherto been Job's main concern, yet Job has

Then answered Zophar the Naamathite, and said, 20
Therefore do my thoughts give answer to me, 2
Even by reason of my haste that is in me.
I have heard the reproof which putteth me to shame, 3
And the spirit of my understanding answereth me.

---

dealt already with the general problem, and that not merely incidentally, but at some length in ch. xii. And on the other hand, while Job discusses more fully the larger issues in the chapters that follow, he also returns to his own relations to God in chs. xxiii, xxix–xxxi. Still, it is true that the centre of gravity does shift somewhat, and the thought of God's misgovernment of the world may well have had a depressing influence on his personal relation to Him.

xx. 1–3. Zophar is moved to swift reply.

xx. 4–29. Does not Job know how brief is the joy of the wicked, how certain his doom, how utter the loss of his ill-gotten wealth, how terrible his destruction.

xx. **2.** Zophar begins an impetuous harangue, for he has been deeply irritated by Job's words. The references in Job's speech which have so provoked him are probably xix. 2, 3, 22, 28, 29.

Therefore do my thoughts give answer to me. The LXX, followed by several scholars, reads 'Not so (*lō' kēn* for *lākēn*) do my thoughts answer me.' The idea of a colloquy between Zophar and his thoughts is rather artificial; Duhm reads 'stir me up.'

Even by reason of my haste that is in me: the marg. renders, 'And by reason of *this* my haste is within me.' Probably this is the sense, though it is questionable whether it does not involve a slight change in the Hebrew.

3. The reason why he breaks into such vehement speech.

And the spirit of my understanding answereth me: marg. 'But out of my understanding *my* spirit answereth me'; neither translation yields a good sense. The word translated **spirit** means also 'wind.' Some accordingly translate 'wind [arising] from my understanding answers me.' In that case the preposition (*min*, 'out of,' 'from') expresses origin, Zophar's understanding calls forth 'wind' from Job. In favour of the sense 'wind' is the fact that elsewhere Bildad (viii. 2) and Eliphaz (xv. 2) begin their speeches by stigmatizing Job's words as wind. The preposition may also mean 'without' (as in xix. 26, 'without my flesh'), and Duhm, on the basis of the LXX, with a slight alteration of the Hebrew, gets the much more satisfactory sense, 'And with wind void of understanding thou answerest me.' Ley reads 'And with his windy understanding he answers me.' Marshall prefers

4 Knowest thou *not* this of old time,
Since man was placed upon earth,
5 That the triumphing of the wicked is short,
And the joy of the godless but for a moment?
6 Though his excellency mount up to the heavens,
And his head reach unto the clouds;
7 Yet he shall perish for ever like his own dung:
They which have seen him shall say, Where is he?
8 He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found:
Yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night.
9 The eye which saw him shall see him no more;
Neither shall his place any more behold him.
10 His children shall seek the favour of the poor,
And his hands shall give back his wealth.

---

to take the preposition as comparative, 'windy speech beyond my comprehension answereth me.'

4. The natural translation of the Hebrew is, **Knowest thou this of old?** In that case the question is a mocking one, Have you this fine windy knowledge (verse 3) from the time of creation? like the mockery of Eliphaz xv. 7, 8 and of God xxxviii. 21. The R.V. inserts *not*, and the reference in 'this' is to what follows, the short-lived joy of the wicked. Perhaps we should correct the text and substitute 'not' for 'this' in the Hebrew. For the second line cf. Deut. iv. 32.

7. It is unnecessary to eliminate by mistranslation or emendation the vigorous coarseness, so characteristic of the speaker. There need be no reference to the custom alluded to in Ezek. iv. 15, though this kind of fuel is still in common use.

8. Cf. Ps. lxxiii. 20, which in its original form probably ran 'As a dream after waking shall they be, When thou art aroused, thou shalt despise their semblance.' (See the writer's *Problem of Suffering in the O. T.*, p. 115.)

9. The verse is absent in the LXX, and is struck out by Bickell and Duhm. The second line is very like vii. 10, the first line recalls vii. 8 and repeats the thought of the second line of verse 7; cf. viii. 18. The eye is hardly the eye of God.

10. The first line seems to mean that the orphans of the rich oppressor will be reduced to such straits that they will even have

His bones are full of his youth,
But it shall lie down with him in the dust. 11
Though wickedness be sweet in his mouth,
Though he hide it under his tongue; 12
Though he spare it, and will not let it go,
But keep it still within his mouth; 13
Yet his meat in his bowels is turned,
It is the gall of asps within him. 14
He hath swallowed down riches, and he shall vomit them
up again: 15

---

to court the poor, who, poor though they may be, are less destitute than themselves. The marg. says '*Or, as otherwise read*, The poor shall oppress his children.' This seems scarcely so good. The second line is rather surprising, since unless we suppose that 'his hands' can mean his hand by the agency of his children, an utterly improbable sense, we must assume that the first line of the verse refers to the time after his death, while this springs back to his lifetime. This is unlikely in two parallel lines. It is true that verse 11 refers to the evil-doer in his lifetime, but the previous description has come to an end, and with verse 11 a new beginning is made (hence there is no need, with Duhm, to strike out verse 10). Budde makes the excellent suggestion that for 'his hands' we should read 'his children,' inserting a single consonant; we thus get a parallel to 'his sons' (R.V. 'children') in the first line. The riches he has fraudulently amassed are given back by his children.

11. While his bones are full of vigour he is cut off. 'It' is 'his youth,' which is buried with him in his grave. The A. V. translated 'His bones are full *of the sin* of his youth,' and this view has had a wide currency. The meaning would be that his bones were rotten by reason of his debauchery. But this is not the true rendering.

12. Sin is described as a dainty tit-bit, which the sinner will not swallow, but keeps turning round and round in his mouth to let the whole expanse of his organ of taste enjoy its delicious sweetness. A chapter in *Pelham* is a good commentary.

14. Exquisite though its taste may be, the food turns to poison when swallowed; cf. Rev. x. 9, 10; Prov. xxiii. 32.

15. A new metaphor suggested by the preceding. He must disgorge the gains he has so greedily gulped down. The figure of God administering the emetic is coarse and powerful, as befits Zophar, cf. the description of Babylon being compelled to release

God shall cast them out of his belly.
16 He shall suck the poison of asps:
The viper's tongue shall slay him.
17 He shall not look upon the rivers,
The flowing streams of honey and butter.
18 That which he laboured for shall he restore, and shall not swallow it down;
According to the substance that he hath gotten, he shall not rejoice.

Israel: 'I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed up' (Jer. li. 44, cf. 34). The LXX, shocked at Zophar's language, substituted 'an angel' for 'God.'

16. Budde thinks the verse is probably a gloss on verse 14, wrongly introduced into the text. It would follow better on verse 14. It is not clear what the first line means. If the sense is determined by verse 14, it will mean that the food he sucks in will prove to be the poison of asps. On the other hand, the parallelism suggests that he is stung by asps, whose poison his body drinks in through the wounds. 'Tongue' should not be urged to prove the verse a gloss, as if the poet himself must have written as a naturalist. The darting tongue may well have seemed the seat of the poison.

17. The text can hardly be right. 'Flowing streams' is literally 'streams of, brooks of,' we thus have three words for streams. As the two latter (*nahărē, naḥălē*) are very much alike, it is a plausible suggestion that we should strike out the former and read 'brooks of honey and butter.' Since, however, we have no parallel in the first line to 'honey and butter' in the second, the question arises whether the word 'streams of' may not really be an assimilation to the following word from such an original parallel. Klostermann very cleverly suggests that we should correct it into *yiṣhār* 'oil,' 'he shall not look upon rivers of oil, streams of honey and butter.' This is better than Duhm's ingenious reconstruction 'He shall not feed on the milk of the meadows, On valleys of honey and butter,' which has, however, support from the LXX. The word translated 'brooks' may also mean 'valleys.'

18. He cannot keep his ill-gotten gains, and will have no joy corresponding to his acquisitions. The text is dubious. The second line is long, and the expression 'according to the wealth of his exchange he shall not rejoice' (so literally) is curious. The word translated 'shall swallow it down' is very like the

For he hath oppressed and forsaken the poor; 19
He hath violently taken away an house, and he shall not build it up.
Because he knew no quietness within him, 20
He shall not save aught of that wherein he delighteth.
There was nothing left that he devoured not; 21
Therefore his prosperity shall not endure.
In the fulness of his sufficiency he shall be in straits: 22
The hand of every one that is in misery shall come upon him.
When he is about to fill his belly, 23
God shall cast the fierceness of his wrath upon him,

---

word translated 'be of good cheer' in ix. 27, and 'take comfort' in x. 20. If we read it here, with Duhm, we get a good parallel to 'rejoice' in the second line. He also omits the word 'according to the wealth of,' and with another slight change gets the sense 'He increases gain, and is not of good cheer, His exchange, and does not rejoice.'

19. He oppresses the poor and callously leaves them to their fate, so he shall not be established in the possession of that which he has seized. The margin reads 'which he builded not.'

20. within him: marg. 'in his greed,' Heb. 'in his belly.' His craving for wealth was never sated, so he shall lose everything. Several translate the second line 'He shall not escape with that wherein he delighteth.' The LXX reads 'His safety is not in his possessions,' and this is preferred by some, and yields a better parallelism. Duhm reads 'He has no rest with his treasure.'

22. Destitution overtakes him in the midst of his luxury. Perhaps, altering one point, we should read 'misery' for 'one that is in misery,' 'every power of misery comes upon him.' So LXX and Vulgate, followed by several scholars.

23. A difficult verse. If the text is right, the margin should perhaps be preferred: 'Let it be for the filling of his belly that *God* shall cast the fierceness of His wrath upon him.' Apart from the fact that the verse has three lines, the Hebrew is surprising, and some strike out this line. G. H. B. Wright, followed by Budde and Marshall, reads 'Yahweh' for 'it shall be' (*y^ehî*). This is an easy emendation, but Yahweh is avoided by the poet in the dialogue.

And shall rain it upon him while he is eating.
24 He shall flee from the iron weapon,
And the bow of brass shall strike him through.
25 He draweth it forth, and it cometh out of his body:
Yea, the glittering point cometh out of his gall;
Terrors are upon him.
26 All darkness is laid up for his treasures:

---

while he is eating: i.e. apparently the judgement comes on him while he is revelling. But it would be better to translate with the marg. 'as his food.' Just as God rained manna, the angels' food, on His people, so He will rain His fierce wrath to glut the hunger of the greedy. The word is strangely written, and several emendations have been proposed. The best is 'snares' as in Ps. xi. 6, 'On the wicked he shall rain snares' (so Merx, Siegfried, and Klostermann). The word 'upon him' would usually mean 'upon them.' The plural form may be used for the singular, or may be due to the similar termination of the next word. Duhm thinks the original text was 'And rains upon him his wrath,' and that a reader wrote on the margin the word 'flood' (*mabbūl*), the three consonants were mistakenly introduced into the text and produced the present reading. This is most ingenious, but hardly more.

24. The metaphor changes, warriors surround him; while he flees from one in 'iron armour' another pierces him with a shaft from his brass bow. Cf. Amos v. 19. Duhm strikes out this verse and the first two lines of verse 25, as breaking the connexion, but quite needlessly.

25. The wounded man draws out the arrow. **Body** should be 'back.' Usually it is thought that he is supposed to be struck in the back, and pierced right through the body, and then to draw out the arrow at the front. This is questionable; perhaps with some scholars we should adopt what seems to have been the LXX reading, 'and the missile cometh out of his back.' In that case he is hit in front and the arrow is sent with such force that it pierces the body through.

Terrors are upon him: omitted by the LXX. If the line connects with what goes before, the description reaches a powerful climax in the horrors that close in on the death-stricken man. If the poet kept strictly to his scheme of couplets, it should be parallel to the first line of verse 26.

26. Usually the first line is thought to mean that calamity is destined for his treasures. The translation 'treasures' is rather doubtful, literally the word means 'his hidden things,' and it is

A fire not blown *by man* shall devour him;
It shall consume that which is left in his tent.
The heavens shall reveal his iniquity, 27
And the earth shall rise up against him.
The increase of his house shall depart, 28
His goods shall flow away in the day of his wrath.

---

uncertain whether 'darkness' would be used for calamity in this connexion. The literal meaning of the line is, 'All darkness is concealed for his hidden things,' and there is force in Duhm's remark that this should mean that the darkness which sheltered his treasures is removed; cf. Isa. xlv. 3, 'I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places.' Since 'laid up' and 'treasures' are forms of verbs bearing the same sense, we should perhaps on the basis of the LXX read simply 'darkness is laid up for him,' eliminating the word translated 'his treasures' as a gloss.

A fire not blown: i. e. not kindled by man, but either 'the fire of God' as in i. 16, or one spontaneously arising, mysterious in its origin, needing no human breath to foster its feeble beginning. There is the further possibility that 'not blown' may indicate that it is not a literal fire, but the fire of disease, a fever. But this is not so fine.

27. Heaven and earth unite against him. Apparently there is an allusion to Job's assertion that his witness was in heaven, and his appeal to earth not to cover his blood. Since this verse seems to break the connexion between verses 26, 28, some seek to overcome this difficulty by emendation of verse 28. Budde transposes the two verses.

28. depart: the word is used often for going into exile, though some take it to be from a verb meaning to 'roll,' Dillmann from a verb meaning 'to reveal,' 'The increase of his house must be revealed as that which flows away,' &c. Duhm, following the LXX, reads 'Destruction sweeps away his house.'

His goods **shall flow away:** *lit.* 'things washed away.' The expression is rather abrupt, but it is vigorous and need not be altered. Duhm reads 'a curse in the day of his wrath.'

In this speech Zophar does little more than repeat the views already expounded by Eliphaz and Bildad in the second cycle of the debate, though the general theme that the wicked are doomed to destruction is handled by him with much freshness and power of expression, and a native coarseness absent from the speeches of his fellows. He lays stress on the brevity of the good fortune enjoyed by the wicked. Once more it may be questioned whether

29 This is the portion of a wicked man from God,
And the heritage appointed unto him by God.

21 Then Job answered and said,
2 Hear diligently my speech;
And let this be your consolations.
3 Suffer me, and I also will speak;
And after that I have spoken, mock on.

---

we ought to see in his description, any more than in Bildad's, something specially designed to fit the case of Job. If he were really the type of man intended, the picture would serve as a warning; but if not, the speech was relevant in the debate as vindicating the Divine government that Job had impugned. Now that all three have stated this position, the poet lets Job pulverize it. Eliphaz had stated it, and Bildad had followed on his lines, but Job had been too absorbed in the question of his relations with God to reply.

xxi. 1–6. Job invites the close attention of the friends to the terrible truths he will bring before them.

xxi. 7–13. Why do the wicked live on to old age, become mighty, have many children, prosper and live happily, and die without lingering illness?

xxi. 14–22. Yet they deliberately renounced God, since His service was unprofitable. How often is it that they are visited with calamity? Let God inflict punishment on the wicked himself, not on his children, of whose suffering he would have no knowledge. How foolish to teach wisdom to God, who judges the angels.

xxi. 23–26. How different the lot of man, yet all die alike.

xxi. 27–34. Job understands their insinuations. But travellers tell how the wicked are spared in time of disaster, live without rebuke or retribution, rest peacefully in the tomb, and have innumerable imitators. How useless then for the friends to comfort him with their sophistries.

xxi. **2.** Eliphaz had dignified the smug doctrine he and his friends administered to Job by the name 'the consolations of God' (xv. 11), and Job had retorted 'Tormenting comforters are ye all' (xvi. 2). Now he asks for their silence while they listen to his indictment of the world's moral government; this will console him more than any of their lip-consolation.

3. mock on: marg. 'shalt thou mock.' The change from plur.

As for me, is my complaint to man? 4
And why should I not be impatient?
Mark me, and be astonished, 5
And lay your hand upon your mouth.
Even when I remember I am troubled, 6
And horror taketh hold on my flesh.
Wherefore do the wicked live, 7
Become old, yea, wax mighty in power?
Their seed is established with them in their sight, 8
And their offspring before their eyes.
Their houses are safe from fear, 9

---

to sing. is to single out Zophar, who could utter such a speech as his last in reply to Job's moving utterance in ch. xix. Several, however, follow the LXX in reading the plural. The LXX also reads a negative, but the sense that after they had heard what Job had to say they would feel in no mood to mock, though accepted by several recent scholars, seems less good than that yielded by the text.

4. to man: marg. 'of man.' The meaning seems to be 'against man.' Why should *you* be so vexed? I fly at higher game. The second line is literally 'and why should not my spirit be short?' cf. our 'short-tempered,' and the expression in vi. 11 'to prolong the soul,' i. e. to be patient.

5. Mark me: Heb. 'Look unto me.'

6. He at least, whatever the friends may feel, shudders when he thinks of God's immoral government of the world. He says 'even' because the mere thought fills him with horror, if so, how awful the spectacle of the world's misery, how unspeakable the misery itself!

7. Job is not seeking a dialectical triumph over the friends, for the question he puts to them is, as verse 6 shows, one that overpowers him with horror. He propounds to them the problem that torments himself: Why do the wicked prosper?

8. First, as befits one whose crowning loss was that of all his children, the bereaved man places the fact that the wicked have their children all about them to the end. Since in the next two verses he refers to his cattle and then in verse 11 again to his children, some think the order has been dislocated. If so, since verse 11 cannot be separated from verse 12, we should have to place this verse immediately before it. This, however, is unnecessary.

Neither is the rod of God upon them.
10 Their bull gendereth, and faileth not;
Their cow calveth, and casteth not her calf.
11 They send forth their little ones like a flock,
And their children dance.
12 They sing to the timbrel and harp,
And rejoice at the sound of the pipe.
13 They spend their days in prosperity,
And in a moment they go down to Sheol.
14 Yet they said unto God, Depart from us;
For we desire not the knowledge of thy ways.
15 What is the Almighty, that we should serve him?
And what profit should we have, if we pray unto him?

---

9. the rod of God: which had so sorely smitten Job. For **safe from fear** the marg. gives 'in peace without fear.'

11. Cf. Ps. cvii. 41. His children are very numerous is the point of **like a flock.** It is curious that such a festive life Job's children also had lived; but they breathed an atmosphere of piety, guarded from guilt by their father's anxious care. They were cut off, but the children of the wicked live on in pleasure.

12. They sing: *lit.* 'they lift up,' i. e. the voice. The reference is to the wicked, not to their children.

13. in a moment: the swift death for which Job so vainly longs. Theirs is not an untimely death. They live the full measure of years (verse 7), in happiness to the last, and are spared death by the torture of a lingering illness. Several translate 'in peace.' The verb pointed in the text means 'they are scared,' but this, which would be suitable in Pss. xlix, lxxiii, is out of place here. An alteration of the points gives the sense 'go down.' Siegfried reads, in harmony with the LXX, 'And in the freedom of Sheol they rest'—much less vivid.

14. The irreligious, sceptical temper that here finds expression is several times referred to in the O. T. An early instance is Isa. v. 18, 19, and references to 'the scorners,' who utter this kind of language, are frequent in the prophetic literature, the Proverbs, and the Psalms. The description in Ps. lxxiii should be compared.

15. The wail of the pious in Malachi and of the author of Ps. lxxiii that the service of God is unprofitable is here urged as the reason for neglect of Him. Religion does not pay. 'Business is

Lo, their prosperity is not in their hand: 16
The counsel of the wicked is far from me.
How oft is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out? 17
That their calamity cometh upon them?
That *God* distributeth sorrows in his anger?
That they are as stubble before the wind, 18
And as chaff that the storm carrieth away?

---

business' is the maxim by which they regulate their relations with God. They get on just as well without God as with Him; they are not such fools as to 'serve God for nought.' Cf. the higgling Jacob's vow, Gen. xxviii. 20–22.

16. If we translate the first line as in R. V. the meaning seems to be that they do not create their own prosperity, but God Himself confers it on them. God rewards their neglect by lavishing His bounty on them. Many, however, suppose that this is an objection from the friends anticipated by Job (marg. inserts *Ye say*), or perhaps actually uttered by Eliphaz, who repeats the second line in xxii. 18. In that case the meaning will be, Their fortune is not in their own, but in a higher hand, God will destroy it. Duhm reads as a question, and corrects the pronoun in the second line in accordance with the LXX, 'Is not their prosperity in their hand, The counsel of the wicked far from Him?' i. e. they control their own destiny, God does not concern Himself with their plans. Budde omits the second line, which in its present form seems out of harmony with its context.

17. Cf. Prov. xiii. 9, xx. 20, xxiv. 20. Bildad had said 'The light of the wicked shall be put out' (xviii. 5), and 'calamity shall be ready for his halting' (12). Job replies that this but rarely happens, not that it never happens. But it is a mistake to emphasize this as the starting-point for further concessions to the traditional view. The marg. reads 'How oft is the lamp of the wicked put out, and *how oft* cometh their calamity upon them! *God* distributeth sorrows in his anger. They are as stubble before the wind, And as chaff that the storm carrieth away.' This is clearly impossible as an expression of Job's sentiments, and can hardly be an anticipation of the argument of the friends or an interruption, since it comes immediately before such a statement (verse 19), and no reply is made to it.

18. Cf. Ps. i. 4; Isa. xvii. 13. Siegfried takes verses 16–18 as an interpolation designed to bring Job's speeches into conformity to the orthodox doctrine of retribution. But they may be explained in harmony with Job's point of view.

19 *Ye say*, God layeth up his iniquity for his children.
Let him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it.
20 Let his own eyes see his destruction,
And let him drink of the wrath of the Almighty.
21 For what pleasure hath he in his house after him,
When the number of his months is cut off in the midst?
22 Shall any teach God knowledge?
Seeing he judgeth those that are high.

---

19. Here again, according to the text, Job anticipates an objection the friends may make, or one of them interrupts him with it. If the latter, it may, as Moulton, followed by Marshall, suggests, be Bildad who speaks, though in viii. 4 he traces the death of Job's children to their own transgression. It was an old-established view that the sins of the fathers were visited on the children to the third and fourth generations, a view very emphatically repudiated by Ezekiel, and if text and translation are right here, by Job in answer to it. It is no punishment to the sinner that his children are punished after he is dead, for in Sheol he does not know how his dearest ones fare, but all his thin stream of consciousness is centred on himself (xiv. 21, 22). The marg. renders: 'God layeth up his iniquity for his children: he rewardeth him, and he shall know it. His eyes shall see his destruction, and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty.' There can have been no reason for inserting it, except that it is the A.V. rendering. Ley and Duhm suggest another view. The word for 'God' is *'Eloah*, but naturally it should stand in a different place in the sentence. The similar word for 'God,' *'El*, would as otherwise pointed (*'al*) be a negative particle, and they think this stood originally in the text, which would then run 'Let him not lay up iniquity for his children.' This yields a very vigorous sense, and as the friends have not maintained, and were not likely to maintain, that the sinner escaped and his children suffered in his stead, it should probably be preferred. The usual view is supported by reference to v. 4 and xx. 10, but these verses do not maintain that the children suffer instead of the sinner, but that they suffer as well.

21. Cf. xiv. 21, 22; Eccles. ix. 5, 6. **pleasure:** here 'interest' would be better.

22. Here again some find an objection anticipated or made by the friends, perhaps Zophar, to the effect that Job is setting up to be wiser than God. But though they might have passed this criticism, and did in fact say similar things (iv. 17, 18, xv. 7, 8,

One dieth in his full strength, 23
Being wholly at ease and quiet:
His breasts are full of milk, 24
And the marrow of his bones is moistened.
And another dieth in bitterness of soul, 25
And never tasteth of good.
They lie down alike in the dust, 26
And the worm covereth them.
Behold, I know your thoughts, 27
And the devices which ye wrongfully imagine against me.
For ye say, Where is the house of the prince? 28
And where is the tent wherein the wicked dwelt?

15., there is no reason why they should say it at this point, moreover Job makes no reply. He means that the friends by their assertion of the harmonious adjustment of destiny to conduct, their 'all's blue' creed, were really pretending to be wiser than God, whose real stood in sharp contrast to their ideal. God judges the angels (cf. iv. 18, xv. 15, xxv. 2, 5; Pss. lviii, lxxxii; Isa. xxiv. 21–23), how foolish for men to misdescribe His judgement of the world. Why Job should not have said this, a reason some urge for altering the text, is unintelligible. It is very interesting to compare Paul's statement that the saints will judge the angels (1 Cor. vi. 3), and his inference that they ought to be able to settle the small squabbles of a Christian community.

24. breasts: the word occurs only here. The marg. 'milk pails' is to be preferred, in spite of the fact that the parallel line names a part of the body. The moistening of his marrow means that he is refreshed and strengthened.

26. It is noteworthy that here Job does not mechanically reverse the doctrine of the friends, and allot happiness to the evil and calamity to the good. 'He sees life steadily and sees it whole' in these few lines. Fate deals out its awards irrespective of moral criteria. It is the dissimilarity in the common human lot that moves him, rather than its ethical perversity.

27. It is usually thought that Job means that the lurid descriptions which the friends have given of the transgressor's fate were intended for him.

28. prince: i. e. the rich oppressor. His home has been destroyed. The second line is literally 'Where the tent of the dwellings of the wicked.' Probably 'the tent of' should be

29 Have ye not asked them that go by the way?
And do ye not know their tokens?
30 That the evil man is reserved to the day of calamity?
That they are led forth to the day of wrath?
31 Who shall declare his way to his face?
And who shall repay him what he hath done?
32 Yet shall he be borne to the grave,
And shall keep watch over the tomb.
33 The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him,

---

struck out as due to dittography of the preceding word, which is very similar.

29. Those who have travelled, and thus formed their conclusions on a large induction of data, contradict the view of the friends, and substantiate their assertions by their tokens, i. e. the instances that have fallen under their observation.

30. The translation gives a wholly unsuitable meaning, but is a more faithful rendering of the text than the marg. 'That the evil man is spared in the day of calamity? That they are led away in the day of wrath?' This, however, gives a good sense with slight alteration, and may be accepted, though several other expedients have been proposed.

31. refers to the wicked man, not, as some take it, to God.

32. The marg. renders 'Moreover' for 'Yet,' and present for the future tenses in this and the next verse. It also reads in the second line 'they shall keep watch,' taking the third person singular as an indefinite, 'one shall keep watch.' If the translation in the text is retained, the reference is to the effigy of the dead man that is placed over his tomb and is thought to watch it. Such a conception was quite natural to antiquity, which identified deities with their images, and even among modern peoples it is not an uncommon experience to feel that the portrait of a friend is watching one. If we translate as in the margin, the meaning is that precautions are taken against injury to the body; he is as guarded against mischief after death as in his life. Klostermann, however, by two trifling alterations gets the sense, 'And he shall be borne to the grave, he comes to rest as a shock of corn goeth up'; see v. 26, where the word here translated 'tomb' is used in the sense of 'a shock of corn.'

33. The description fitly closes with the idyllic touch of perfect peace in the bosom of the fragrant earth. A life so full of unbroken happiness, lived out to its full measure, rounded off by sleep so sweet and grateful, was bound to attract many imitators,

And all men shall draw after him,
As there were innumerable before him.
How then comfort ye me in vain, 34
Seeing in your answers there remaineth *only* falsehood?

---

who reversing Balaam's maxim might say 'Let me die the death of the wicked,' just as many had preceded him in his evil-doing. It would be possible to take the second line of the verse to mean that all men flock to his grave, but this would involve striking out the third line, as an addition by one who misinterpreted the second line of moral imitation. Cf. Eccl. iv. 15, 16.

the valley: the favourite position for graves.

34. comfort ye me: notice how the speech ends on the note with which it began. Cf. xvi. 2.

falsehood: marg. 'faithlessness.'

With this speech the second cycle of the debate closes. The friends, who in their first speeches had dwelt on the purity, the greatness, the wisdom of God, in this series have little to say except of the evil fate of the wicked, a thought on which Eliphaz and Bildad had also laid stress before. Thus they vindicate God's moral government of the world. Job does not concern himself with their assertions till his concluding speech, being absorbed through his earlier speeches in this cycle with his own sad fate and the groping after God. From his former pleading to God that He would shelter him in Sheol from His anger, and then recall him to the old fellowship of love, an aspiration that he sets aside as hopeless, he advances to the belief that he will not go unvindicated, but that his Witness is on high. Then he moves forward to the thought not only that God will stand on his grave as his Vindicator, but that he himself shall behold Him. Yet these flights of faith are not sustained, though Job's sense of God's alienation is henceforth less sharp than before. And while the personal problem weighs on him now more lightly, the general problem is not one whit relieved. We should have anticipated that, once Job has reached the conviction that God's animosity to him is but transient, he would apply this principle to the apparent immorality of God's rule. But in the last speech of this cycle, which is devoted to this topic, he affirms, in reply to the friends, his deliberate conviction that the wicked prosper. The distinction in God, which has mitigated the personal difficulty, does not emerge here. We may well ask the reason. It may be suggested that the poet meant to show us that Job felt the pressure of the personal problem much more keenly than that of the general, and also had more data for its solution. True, he speaks of himself as

22 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,
2 Can a man be profitable unto God?
Surely he that is wise is profitable unto himself.

---

horror-stricken when he thinks of God's unrighteous rule. Yet his need for a solution was felt with less urgency, since he himself was not involved. His own relation with God belonged to those things of which people say 'I must settle it or go mad.' The question of God's moral government looms up behind it, and is a question of far more radical significance, but it is more abstract, and does not touch him on the raw. Therefore he contents himself with stating it in its naked horror, but does not feel impelled to move towards a solution. Moreover, the conviction of God's misgovernment was derived from observation, while, to set against his present sense of God's hostility, he had a long experience of His goodness to him. Hence he had not the immediate consciousness to start from in the larger, which he had in the personal, problem.

xxii. 1–5. Eliphaz replies, since God has no interest in man's righteousness, and He cannot punish Job for his piety, it is plain that Job is a great sinner.

xxii. 6–11. He has been a remorseless creditor, has refused bread and water to the hungry and weary, oppressed the widow and orphan. Therefore he is now suffering from traps and terrors, his light is turned into darkness, the floods overwhelm him.

xxii. 12–20. God is at the pinnacle of heaven; Job thinks that He cannot see through the clouds the deeds of man. Yet the wicked of old time who renounced God perished, to the joy of the righteous.

xxii. 21–30. Let Job receive God's instruction through the speaker. If he returns humbly to God, puts away unrighteousness, casts away his gold and makes God his treasure, then he shall be restored to communion with Him, his life shall be prosperous, and even the guilty will be delivered in virtue of his innocence.

2. Eliphaz argues, since the Almighty has no interest or pleasure in a man's righteousness, He will be under no temptation to distort the truth about his real character, but will treat him in harmony with his actual conduct. Therefore Job's suffering must be due to sin. The argument is interesting. God is the cold, passionless ruler, who has no vital concern in man's conduct, and adjusts retribution to behaviour with the inhuman precision of a machine. To such an automaton pity and spite would be alike unknown. Moreover, He is far too great to be affected by

Is it any pleasure to the Almighty, that thou art righteous? 3
Or is it gain *to him*, that thou makest thy ways perfect?
Is it for thy fear *of him* that he reproveth thee, 4
That he entereth with thee into judgement?
Is not thy wickedness great? 5
Neither is there any end to thine iniquities.
For thou hast taken pledges of thy brother for nought, 6
And stripped the naked of their clothing.

---

the petty concerns of men. Job himself had argued from the latter premiss that God should not deign to notice man's sins, inasmuch as they could not injure Him (vii. 20). Eliphaz puts his point rather strangely. We should have expected rather, God gets no advantage from making you out to be a sinner, otherwise we could understand His afflicting an innocent man, and thus branding him as a criminal. Lies are told because the liar hopes to get something by them. If you are white God has no interest in painting you black, but if you are black you have the greatest inducement to paint yourself white. Your self-vindication cannot be trusted where the disinterested evidence against you is so damning. The principle taken for granted by Eliphaz is that suffering, such as Job endures, implies that God means by it to mark the sufferer as a sinner. This axiom was common to Job and the friends, but was, of course, incorrect.

4. for thy fear *of him*. This translation is much to be preferred to that in the margin 'for fear of thee,' though this would yield an appropriate sense in a context which speaks of God's self-interest as a possible motive for His action. The word is used several times by Eliphaz in the sense of piety, and this determines its meaning here. The thought expressed is that it is incredible that God should punish Job for his piety, the speaker therefore proceeds in the next verse on the ground of his suffering to assert his wickedness.

5. The description which now follows has its counterpart in Job's oath of innocence in ch. xxxi. The sins named are those to which the rich and powerful are specially prone, particularly in the East.

6. The second line explains the first. In his merciless avarice he has taken advantage of the desperate extremity of his clansmen, and in security for loans has deprived them of their under-garment. The word **naked** does not mean that they were absolutely naked, cf. Isa. xx. 3; but they were so poor that they possessed only the long tunic worn next the skin. Since this was all they had to protect themselves against the cold at night, the creditor was

7 Thou hast not given water to the weary to drink,
And thou hast withholden bread from the hungry.
8 [M] But as for the mighty man, he had the earth;
And the honourable man, he dwelt in it.
9 [A] Thou hast sent widows away empty,
And the arms of the fatherless have been broken.
10 Therefore snares are round about thee,
And sudden fear troubleth thee,
11 Or darkness, that thou canst not see,
And abundance of waters cover thee.

---

forbidden even in the oldest law (Exod. xxii. 26, 27) to keep it after sunset, 'for that is his only covering, it is his garment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep?' cf. the law in Deut. xxiv. 10–13, where we have also a tender delicacy for the debtor's sensitiveness not only to cold but to shame, cf. Deut. xxiv. 17. **for nought** seems to mean without cause: he was not driven to do it by his own necessity.

7. Cf. Isa. lviii. 7, 10; Matt. xxv. 42. He neglected Lazarus at his gate.

8. The meaning seems to be that Job had acted like the sinners denounced in Isa. v. 8, who to secure large estates for themselves ruthlessly evicted the defenceless proprietors of small holdings. **the mighty man** (*lit.* 'the man of arm') and **the honourable man** (*lit.* 'he whose person is accepted') seem both to mean Job, who is spoken of in the third person to make the words more exasperating, just as Isaiah diverges from the second to the third person, from passionate, excited address to crushing scorn, in his denunciation of Shebna (Isa. xxii. 16). It would be possible to distinguish between 'the mighty man' who possessed the land and 'the honourable man' or 'favourite' who dwelt in it, the latter being Job himself. Siegfried treats the verse as a gloss, and the same suggestion had occurred to the present writer. Budde favours it.

11. The verse is more usually translated as in the marg. 'Or dost thou not see the darkness, and the flood of waters that covereth thee?' and this is explained, Do you not comprehend the significance of your calamities. But this explanation forces a meaning into the question, which is quite pointless as it stands; Job was only too conscious of his troubles. We should follow the LXX and read instead of the first line, 'Thy light has become darkness.'

Is not God in the height of heaven? 12
And behold the height of the stars, how high they are!
And thou sayest, What doth God know? 13
Can he judge through the thick darkness?
Thick clouds are a covering to him, that he seeth not; 14
And he walketh in the circuit of heaven.
Wilt thou keep the old way 15
Which wicked men have trodden?
Who were snatched away before their time, 16
Whose foundation was poured out as a stream:
[M] Who said unto God, Depart from us; 17

---

12. The connexion with the following verses is not clear. This verse in itself seems to mean God is so lofty that He sees all things, since all lie beneath Him, before His gaze. Then the next verses would mean, How foolish then for you to say that His vision cannot penetrate through the clouds. But the connexion might be, Is not God exalted? Yes, too exalted, you say, to mark man's ways. Duhm thinks the verse is a gloss, derived from a poem on the exaltation of God.

behold the height of the stars. The topmost star will give you the measure how high God is. But it would be better to change the pointing and instead of 'behold' read 'he beholdeth.' The word translated 'height' is literally 'head.' The meaning seems to be the highest star; it might refer to a constellation, though we do not know of one that went by the name 'The head of the stars.' Budde's suggestion, that the word has arisen through dittography of the preceding word, is plausible.

14. in the circuit: better as in the marg. 'on the vault,' since it is a question of God's elevation above the world. Duhm thinks 'the circle of heaven' is the far horizon, where earth and heaven meet, inaccessible to man, and regarded as the home of physical marvels and of spirits and demons.

15. A glance at history would convince Job of his mistake. So the rebels of old time defied God and were swept away. The reference is either to the Flood story, or perhaps to some story now no longer preserved, such as the fate of the Nephilim referred to in Gen. vi. 1–4.

Wilt thou keep: better than marg. 'dost thou mark.'

16. Bickell, following LXX, omits verses 13–16.

17, 18. The first line is taken from xxi. 14^{a}, the second is practically synonymous with xxi. 15^{a}, the third has points of

And, What can the Almighty do for us?
18 Yet he filled their houses with good things:
But the counsel of the wicked is far from me.
19 [A] The righteous see it, and are glad;
And the innocent laugh them to scorn:
20 *Saying*, Surely they that did rise up against us are cut off,
And the remnant of them the fire hath consumed.
21 Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace:
Thereby good shall come unto thee.
22 Receive, I pray thee, the law from his mouth,
And lay up his words in thine heart.
23 If thou return to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up;
If thou put away unrighteousness far from thy tents.

---

connexion with xxi. 16[a], while the fourth repeats xxi. 16[b]. The two verses also break the connexion between verses 16 and 19. They are probably an intrusion into the text (so Budde and Duhm). Verse 18 is treated as a gloss by Merx and Siegfried.

for us: marg. 'to us.' The Heb. reads 'them' instead of 'us.'

19. Cf. Ps. cvii. 42.

20. the remnant of them: marg. 'that which remained to them' is to be preferred to the text, and to the alternative marg. 'their abundance.' **the fire** hardly suits those who were destroyed in the deluge. Ewald accordingly referred the description to the destruction of the Cities of the Plain. Dillmann thinks the verse may be a gloss, but its omission would get rid of two lines which disturb his scheme of strophes.

21. Now follow exhortation and promise, just as in the peroration to Eliphaz' first speech, and indeed the other speeches of the first cycle. It is noteworthy that in the second cycle no comforting prospect is held out.

The second line is more accurately rendered, according to the consonants, in the marg. 'Thereby shall thine increase be good'; but probably the translation in the text represents what the author wrote.

22. the law: better, as in marg., 'instruction.'

23. thou shalt be built up. It is much better to read with several scholars, after the LXX, 'and humblest thyself.'

If thou put away. The marg. 'Thou shalt put away . . . and shalt lay up' is inappropriate.

And lay thou *thy* treasure in the dust, 24
And *the gold of* Ophir among the stones of the brooks;
And the Almighty shall be thy treasure, 25
And precious silver unto thee.
For then shalt thou delight thyself in the Almighty, 26
And shalt lift up thy face unto God.
Thou shalt make thy prayer unto him, and he shall hear 27
thee;
And thou shalt pay thy vows.
Thou shalt also decree a thing, and it shall be established 28
unto thee;
And light shall shine upon thy ways.

---

24. The LXX omits this verse, Bickell and Duhm verse 25 also. It makes the sentence long, but there is no cogent reason for omitting it. The meaning is that Job should cast his 'treasure' (*lit.* 'ore') 'in the dust' (marg. 'on the earth') or into the brook, as worthless, and make God his portion. For the second line Budde reads 'And *the gold of* Ophir in the sand of the sea.'

25. precious silver unto thee: marg. 'precious silver shall be thine.' The word translated 'precious' is found in Num. xxiii. 22, xxiv. 8, Ps. xcv. 4, in the two former passages of the horns of the wild-ox, in the third of the heights of the mountains. Probably the text should be emended, and several suggestions have been made. Budde reads 'And his instruction shall be silver to thee'; Duhm, 'And silver phylacteries for thee'; Marshall, 'Sound wisdom shall be silver for thee'; Ley, 'So shall the Almighty be thy treasure, silver and strength for thee.' Siegfried leaves a blank. G. H. B. Wright corrects both lines: 'The fields shall be to thee gold, And lead shall become to thee silver.'

26. Then he shall be restored to fellowship with God and prosperity, cf. xi. 15.

27. Cf. xlii. 9, 10. At present Job bitterly complains because God refuses to hear him.

pay thy vows: a vow was a pledge to give something to God, conditionally on His fulfilling a request. The payment of the vow implied that the prayer had been granted. Here the prayer is apparently for recovery, but it might have a wider sense. Job, like Elkanah, might pay his vow at the time of the yearly sacrifice, for God's blessing on his crops and stock (1 Sam. i. 21).

29 When they cast *thee* down, thou shalt say, *There is* lifting up;
And the humble person he shall save.
30 He shall deliver *even* him that is not innocent:
Yea, he shall be delivered through the cleanness of thine hands.

---

29. A difficult verse. If the text is retained we should probably adopt the marg. 'When they are made low,' and take the subject to be Job's 'ways'; when his path leads him downward into misfortune, he should cheer himself with the thought that it will lead upward. We do not expect any reference to misfortune, however, in this glowing context. Moreover, the word **lifting up** means 'pride,' so that we might take Job's words as a penitent confession, 'Thou shalt say *It was* pride.' The parallel line, and the general use of the verb elsewhere, suggest, however, that the text needs emendation. The general sense required is, God casts down pride, but saves the humble, and probably the original text expressed this thought in a form which we cannot now precisely recover.

30. Again rather difficult. The present text seems to mean that God shall deliver him that is not guiltless on account of the innocence of Job; and this interpretation is strongly confirmed by the sequel, since Eliphaz and his friends were delivered at last through Job's intercession. It is quite in the poet's manner to let the speakers drop unconscious prophecies of the final issue. Yet the text is suspicious. It is not only rather short in the Hebrew, but the word translated 'not,' while common in Rabbinic, occurs elsewhere in the O. T. only in the name Ichabod. The omission of the negative by 'many ancient versions' is obviously due to an attempt to make the passage easier; really it makes it harder, for the innocent would surely be saved by his own innocence rather than by Job's.

In this speech Eliphaz, since nothing else is left for him to do, roundly accuses Job of such sins as were only too common in the East among men of his social standing. It is remarkable that, while none of the speeches in the second cycle end with any comforting promise of restoration on repentance, Eliphaz should close this speech, which has gone beyond all the others in its bitter and unjust charges, with so highly coloured a description of Job's happiness if he will turn to God. It is not quite easy to see why. Perhaps the poet wanted to represent Eliphaz as conscious of the harshness of his speech, feeling, it may be, that he had gone too far. But more probably, as he utters his last

Then Job answered and said, 23
Even to-day is my complaint rebellious : 2
My stroke is heavier than my groaning.

---

speech, the wish to save his friend becomes uppermost, and after the terrors of the Law he would utter the consolations of the Gospel, seeking to win if he could not alarm.

xxiii. 1–7. Job still rebels, though he seeks to repress his complaint. Would that he could find God, lay his case before Him and hear His reply. He would not overwhelm him with power, but would listen and acquit.

xxiii. 8–17. But He eludes Job's search, though He knows Job's ways ; and Job will come as pure gold from His testing, since he has clung with unswerving fidelity to His commands. But He follows His own will, and is not to be turned from it, and not Job alone is the victim of the destiny He appoints. Therefore he is dismayed by God, cut off as he is by the darkness.

xxiv. 1. Why has God not set times of judgement, when His worshippers might see His days ?

xxiv. 2-4. There are oppressors who seize the property of others, even the defenceless, and drive their wretched victims into hiding.

xxiv. 5–12. There are outcasts, who plunder the fields of the rich to feed their starving children, and lie unclad through the cold night, or huddle against the rock for shelter from the mountain storms. [Some pluck the debtor's child from the widow's breast and take the suckling of the poor in pledge.] Naked, hungry, and thirsty, they carry sheaves, make oil and wine. Though the wounded and dying groan, God takes no heed.

xxiv. 13–17. There are those who shun the light, the murderer, the thief, the adulterer. They dig into houses in the dark, keeping themselves close by day, for daylight is their darkness.

[xxiv. 18–21. His doom is swift, his portion accursed, his vineyards barren. Sheol consumes him, as heat melts the snow. His mother forgets him, his greatness passes into oblivion, he is destroyed, he who ill-treated the childless widow.]

xxiv. 22–25. God ensures the continuance of the mighty, he recovers from deadly sickness ; God preserves him and kindly watches over all his ways. [Soon he is brought to nothing, cut off like the ears of corn in harvest.] Who will venture to gainsay this ?

2. It is not an easy verse. The first line yields a fair sense in R. V., especially if Job is taking up charges made by the friends,

3 Oh that I knew where I might find him,
That I might come even to his seat!
4 I would order my cause before him,
And fill my mouth with arguments.
5 I would know the words which he would answer me,
And understand what he would say unto me.
6 Would he contend with me in the greatness of his power?

I am just as **rebellious** to-day as I was yesterday. The marg. '*accounted* rebellion' is therefore unnecessary. The alternative marg. 'bitter' requires a slightly different word to be read. It may quite well be correct, the present text being then due to assimilation to the next word. The R.V. rendering of the second line may safely be set aside. The marg. 'my hand is heavy upon my groaning' is perhaps the best rendering of the present text, the verse will then mean, My complaint is rebellious, though I do what I can to repress it. The alternative marg. 'because of my groaning' is adopted by Ley, the meaning would then be that his hands hang heavily down, he is worn out, because of his groaning; but this departs from the usual meaning of the phrase. The LXX and Syriac read 'His hand,' and many scholars (though not Budde) adopt this. Some then interpret that God's hand forces out his groaning into audible expression. But if the writer had meant this, we may presume that he would have said it. The explanation that God represses his groaning, that He will not listen to it, is also unsatisfactory. It is perhaps best to keep the present text.

3-5. Why should he not be rebellious, baffled in his passionate longing to find God, where He sits as Judge? Then he would marshal his arguments, and learn God's case against him and the defence of His own action.

6. It is very striking how Job's thought of God has softened. In earlier passages, when he had imagined himself before God's bar, it had been with the conviction that God would paralyse him with His terrors, crush him with His omnipotence (ix. 15-20). He had implored Him to release him from his pain, and not affright him with the dread of His Majesty (ix. 34, 35, xiii. 20-22), then he would plead his cause undismayed. Now he expresses the conviction that God would not overwhelm him with power, but listen to his plea. The magnanimity he here ascribes to God contrasts remarkably with the pettiness of which he had before accused Him. And it is all the more noteworthy, since, when God actually speaks, He does contend with him in the greatness of His power. It impoverishes the poem of one of its beauties to

Nay; but he would give heed unto me.
There the upright might reason with him; 7
So should I be delivered for ever from my judge.
Behold, I go forward, but he is not *there*; 8
And backward, but I cannot perceive him:
On the left hand, when he doth work, but I cannot behold 9
him:
He hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him.
But he knoweth the way that I take; 10
When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold.

---

correct the text here into harmony with Job's earlier utterances. The marg. reads in the second line, 'Nay; he would only give heed to me.'

7. If once I could get to God I should be permitted to plead my cause in virtue of my innocence, and thus win my acquittal. Or the meaning might be, Then it would be plain that he who reasons with Him is a righteous man, and he would therefore be acquitted.

8, 9. If he fails to find God it is not for want of effort. The thought is the same as in ix. 11. He is all-pervasive, yet wholly elusive. Budde, Siegfried, and Duhm strike out the verses, the former of which is absent in the LXX. It is thought that they break the connexion between verse 7 and verse 10, and that they are out of place in this context. The ebb and flow of feeling is, it is true, rather rapid, but not incredibly so. There would be no break in the connexion if we could explain verse 10 to give, as God's reason for eluding Job's search, that He knows his innocence and that if tried he would come forth as gold. But this is not probable (see note on verse 10). There is, apart from this, a subtle point of connexion, God's ways are inscrutable to Job (verses 8, 9), but Job's ways are well known to God (verse 10). The adverbs **forward**, &c., might also mean respectively East, West, North, South. The marg. closely connects verse 9^b with verse 10, translating 'He turneth himself to the right hand, that I cannot see him, but he knoweth,' &c. For **when he doth work** it would be better to read with the Syriac 'I seek him.'

10. In spite of this self-concealment He still closely watches Job's ways (*lit.* 'the way *that* is with me'), and the trial to which God will subject him will prove his sterling metal. It is not of suffering as the discipline which smelts out the dross, but as the touch-stone which tests the quality of the gold, that he is speaking. Many scholars adopt the marg. 'For' instead of **But,** and then of

11 My foot hath held fast to his steps;
His way have I kept, and turned not aside.
12 I have not gone back from the commandment of his lips;
I have treasured up the words of his mouth more than my necessary food.
13 But he is in one *mind*, and who can turn him?
And what his soul desireth, even that he doeth.
14 For he performeth that which is appointed for me:
And many such things are with him.
15 Therefore am I troubled at his presence;
When I consider, I am afraid of him.

---

course translate 'If he tried me I should come forth as gold.' The meaning would then be that God will not let Job find Him, just because He knows his innocence, but has resolved not to declare it. But so bitter a charge, while it would have been suitable in Job's earlier speeches, does not harmonize with his present mood. From longing for God he passes to plaintive description of his vain search after Him, then to confidence in the result of his trial, the transitions are rapid, but it is a softened Job who speaks through them all.

11. He looks forward with such confidence because he has adhered with unswerving fidelity to the moral standard imposed on man by God. How striking the contrast of his steadfastness with the incalculable waywardness of God's own dealing with men!

12. more than my necessary food: the Hebrew has no reference to food, and the literal translation is that given in the marg. 'more than my own law' (alternative marg. 'portion'; see Prov. xxx. 8). The explanation given is that the reference is to the law in the members, which Job has put second to the law of God. If Job had been familiar with the Epistle to the Romans this would have been just credible. The LXX and Vulgate read 'in my bosom,' which is obviously correct, and involves very slight change of the unintelligible Hebrew.

13. But he is in one *mind*: the Hebrew is difficult, and neither this rendering nor that in the marg. 'But he is one' is satisfactory. Read with Budde and Duhm 'he has chosen,' or 'decreed' (*bāḥar* for *bᵉeḥad*).

14. The R. V. makes the best of rather uncertain Hebrew. Job has a destiny, fixed by God; not he alone is the victim, who must in misery 'dree his weird.' The verse is omitted in the LXX.

For God hath made my heart faint, 16
And the Almighty hath troubled me:
Because I was not cut off before the darkness, 17
Neither did he cover the thick darkness from my face.
Why are times not laid up by the Almighty? 24

---

17. The translation is incorrect, the second line being unintelligible, and the first introducing a wholly foreign thought. The marg. 'For I am not dismayed because of the darkness, nor because thick darkness covereth my face' gives a fair sense. Eliphaz had said 'Thy light has become darkness' (xxii. 11, see note). Job replies, It is not the darkness that dismays me, but the fact that it is God (verse 16) who has brought it on me. Since, however, Job is hardly likely to have made this subtle distinction, especially since his 'thick darkness' was, more than anything else, *God's* attitude to him, we should probably read with Bickell, Budde, and Duhm 'For I am cut off by the darkness, and thick darkness covers my face.'

xxiv. This chapter has been subjected in recent years to much criticism. Merx led the way in 1871 with the view that verses 9-24, which consist of twelve three-lined stanzas, and describe the course of the world without express blame, were substituted by a redactor for Job's speech, since the latter was too heretical to be preserved. Bickell omits verses 5–8, 10–24, Grill omits verses 5–9, 14–21. Hoffmann assigns verses 13–25 to Bildad and places it after xxv. 6. Siegfried prints verses 13–24 as a correcting interpolation 'conforming the speeches of Job to the orthodox doctrine of retribution.' Duhm thinks verses 1–24 form no connected speech, but a cycle of poems, to which xii. 4-6 and xxx. 2–8 also belong. Unless, however, we insist that the poet must have written throughout in four-lined stanzas, or at least in couplets, we have no ground for denying to him everything written in three-lined stanzas. Moreover, the speech as a whole reflects Job's point of view, though the presence of alien elements has to be recognized. There is, it is true, plausibility in Duhm's suggestion that since we have had in Job's last speech the prosperity of the wicked urged in proof of God's misgovernment of the world, here we expect him to complete his proof by exhibiting the affliction of the righteous. The coincidence of unusual form and unexpected content suffices to justify a measure of uncertainty, but hardly more than a suspended judgement. So Kuenen, who says we can only pronounce a *non liquet*; the explanation of many verses, especially verses 16 ff., is not merely uncertain but

And why do not they which know him see his days?
2 There are that remove the landmarks;
They violently take away flocks, and feed them.
3 They drive away the ass of the fatherless,
They take the widow's ox for a pledge.
4 They turn the needy out of the way:
The poor of the earth hide themselves together.

---

impossible; and under the circumstances any decision on the genuineness is venturesome.

1. The marg. reads 'Why is it, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty, that they which know him see not his days?' i. e. why, since the Almighty has His appointed times for judgement, are not the righteous allowed to see them? This gives a good sense in itself, but Job's problem concerns, not so much the manifestation of God's judgements, but their non-existence. The text gives the better sense, why does not God have at least certain fixed seasons for judgement, even if He does not exercise unsleeping vigilance and execute prompt judgement? Duhm thinks verses 1–4 constitute a separate poem in three-lined stanzas. Hence he has to lengthen the verse a little to get three lines, 'Why is there no judgement from the Almighty? Why are times hidden with Him, And they that know Him see not His Day?' i. e. Why does not the Day of Judgement break? There is no need, however, to drag in apocalyptic here; besides, the attempt to force through a scheme of three-lined stanzas leads later to strange results.

2–4. Mere inspection should suffice to show that in verses 2–4 we have three couplets, not two tristichs. To divide verse 3, in spite of the parallelism, and connect the first line with verse 2, the second with verse 4 (so Duhm), is high-handed theory indeed. Verse 2 represents the powerful oppressors as appropriating the land of others and robbing them of their flocks. Verse 3 refers to their oppression of the defenceless, who had just an ox or an ass to keep them from starvation. Verse 4 shows how, having robbed them, they drive them off to drag out a miserable existence in obscurity.

and feed them: if the text is right, the meaning is apparently that they pay no regard to law or public opinion, but feed the flocks they have plundered as their own. This reads in a good deal. Several scholars read, with the LXX, 'with their shepherd.'

poor: marg. 'meek.' The two are largely synonymous in the Psalms, but here **the poor** is meant literally.

Behold, as wild asses in the desert 5
They go forth to their work, seeking diligently for meat;
The wilderness *yieldeth* them food for their children.
They cut their provender in the field; 6
And they glean the vintage of the wicked.
They lie all night naked without clothing, 7
And have no covering in the cold.
They are wet with the showers of the mountains, 8
And embrace the rock for want of a shelter.

---

5. Now the poet describes a wretched type of pariahs, not necessarily those who have been already mentioned, though their ranks may be recruited from these. We have no definite clue to their identification, beyond what this and the cognate passage xxx. 1-8 contain. They are nameless outcasts, scourged out of the land, barely eking out a livelihood on the poorest food, living in holes, and harried out of society like thieves. These troglodytes were probably aborigines, dispossessed of their lands by some stronger power and driven into the desert.

The verse is not easy. If we omit the words **to their work** we get lines of more normal length, and reading *lō'* 'not' instead of *lō* 'them' (properly 'him') we get the sense, 'Behold, as wild asses of the desert they go forth, Seeking diligently the prey of the wilderness, There is no bread for the children.' The bitterest pang of famine is to see the children starving and to have no bread. The wild ass is gaunt with hunger, and the herds haunt regions remote from men. 'The prey of the wilderness' is part of the metaphor, the scant sustenance they gather is like the rare tufts of herbage, for which the wild ass scours the desert.

6. Since they have no bread for the children they are forced to get food how they can. The word translated **provender** means 'fodder,' but **their** is, as the margin says, rather 'his,' and the singular pronoun is difficult. Hitzig followed the LXX in reading 'that which is not his' instead of 'his fodder.' But it would be better, with several scholars, to adopt Merx's suggestion, 'They reap by night in the field.' Hounded from civilization, they steal by night, since they dare not show their faces to beg by day, a vivid touch. For **wicked** it would be better, with Budde, to read 'rich.'

7. There is not the slightest ground for impoverishing the description by cutting out verse 7 (with Duhm).

8. Unclad and unsheltered they are wet to the skin, as they

9 [M] There are that pluck the fatherless from the breast,
And take a pledge of the poor:
10 [A] *So that* they go about naked without clothing,
And being an-hungred they carry the sheaves;
11 They make oil within the walls of these men;
They tread *their* winepresses, and suffer thirst.
12 From out of the populous city men groan,
And the soul of the wounded crieth out:
Yet God imputeth it not for folly.

---

seek protection close under the rock from the drenching, driving winter rains in the mountains. For **embrace** cf. Lam. iv. 5.

9. If this verse is genuine it is a new picture that is presented to us, the rapacious creditor, who heartlessly plucks the debtor's child from the breast of his widow. The second line is translated in the marg. 'take in pledge that which is on the poor,' but neither this rendering nor that in the text is satisfactory, the words rather mean 'take the poor as pledge.' It would be far better to follow Kamphausen, and, pointing differently, read 'and take in pledge the suckling of the poor,' which gives an excellent parallel to the preceding line. But the verse is out of place here, for in the two following verses the description of the pariahs is probably resumed; in any case they deal with an entirely different subject, moreover this verse belongs rather to verses 2-4. It might come after verse 3, but is perhaps a misplaced marginal gloss.

10. The poet may here speak of day-labourers, too poor to purchase food or clothing, who starve in the midst of plenty, since they work in the harvest, the oil-pressing and vintage, but less happy than the ox, unmuzzled as he treads the corn, are not allowed by the greedy owner to assuage their hunger or slake their thirst. Or they may be the shivering wretches already described, who raid the sheaves of the rich, and press out oil and wine from their olives and grapes, and in their presses, of course by stealth.

12. populous city: *lit.* 'city of men.' But it is better to point with the Syriac 'From out of the city the dying groan,' and thus get a parallel to the next line. Budde places the verse after 14^b. Duhm reads, partly on the basis of the LXX, and taking suggestions from Bickell, 'From city and houses are they chased, And the hunger (*lit.* soul) of the children crieth, But there is none to plead for them.'

imputeth it not for folly: better, 'taketh no heed of the wrong.'

These are of them that rebel against the light; 13
They know not the ways thereof,
Nor abide in the paths thereof.
The murderer riseth with the light, he killeth the poor 14
and needy;
And in the night he is as a thief.
The eye also of the adulterer waiteth for the twilight, 15
Saying, No eye shall see me:
And he disguiseth his face.
In the dark they dig through houses: 16

---

13. Job now enumerates the members of another type of evil-doer, the night-birds, who shun the light, since it hinders the deeds of darkness which they love.

14. First among these children of darkness he names the murderer. But **with the light** yields a very unsuitable sense. It is simplest, with several scholars, to read 'when there is no light' (*lō' 'ōr* for *lā'ōr*). 'Before light' (Bickell) or 'at evening' (Merx) gives good sense, but they are much less like the present text. That he should kill the poor and needy is surprising; he would prowl after more profitable prey. Duhm reads 'he killeth his enemy and foe.' The third line has been brilliantly emended by Merx, whose text is accepted by several commentators, 'and in the night the thief roams about.' The present text is quite unsatisfactory. Budde and Marshall prefix the line to verse 16. This is a much more suitable position, if the text is emended, since the thief is then not mentioned twice, and the order, murderer, adulterer, thief, corresponds to the order of prohibitions in the Decalogue.

15. disguiseth his face: marg. 'putteth a covering on his face.' To make assurance doubly sure, he not only waits till it is dark (Prov. vii. 9), but makes himself unrecognizable; as Wetzstein suggests, possibly puts on a woman's veil to slip unnoticed into the harem.

16. So in Matt. vi. 20 we read, 'where thieves dig through and steal.' The houses are often made of clay, so that the walls can be dug through without much difficulty. An Eastern burglar would hesitate to break into a house through the door because of the sanctity of the threshold. Crossing the threshold brought the person who entered into covenant with the inmates, and any subsequent violence to them or their property would call down the vengeance of the house-god. Trumbull narrates that a woman explained that a thief would not enter by the door 'because of his

They shut themselves up in the day-time ;
They know not the light.
17 For the morning is to all of them as the shadow of death ;
For they know the terrors of the shadow of death.
18 [M] He is swift upon the face of the waters ;
Their portion is cursed in the earth :
He turneth not by the way of the vineyards.

---

reverence.' The translation of the second line in the text is to be preferred to that in the margin, '*Which* they had marked for themselves in the day-time' (so also A.V.), with which the action of the robber in *Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves* might be compared. It would be a pity to translate the first line 'they break out of houses in the dark,' for though this gives a good contrast to the next line we miss the vivid picture of their digging through the wall under cover of the night. The third line is abnormally short and the first line of verse 17 abnormally long. We may rectify this by transferring **all of them** to this line.

17. The morning is to them what the death-shade of midnight is to others, a season of peril, when no work can be done. Others make **the shadow of death** subject, and **morning** predicate, i.e. midnight gloom is their morning, the work-time when they are fullest of energy. This connects well with 16^{a}, but not with $16^{b\,c}$. We hardly expect a reference to the 'terrors of midnight'; if the text is right, **terrors** is spoken rather from the poet's point of view, theirs is the familiarity which breeds contempt.

18. It is clear that verses 18–21 do not express the views of Job, since they assert the punishment of the wicked. The Revisers recognize this by prefixing '*Ye say*' in the margin, to suggest that Job is stating the opinions of the friends. It would be simplest to regard the verses as an interpolation intended to modify Job's assertions of God's immoral government, or as a misplaced portion of the friends' contribution to the debate. Marshall regards the verses as an interruption by Bildad forming his third speech, while Ley thinks it belongs to Bildad's speech, which he reconstructs as follows: xxv. 1–6, xxiv. 18–20, xxvii. 13–23. These views can be profitably discussed only in connexion with the larger problems raised by chs. xxv–xxvii.

The first line might refer to sea or river pirates, who scud along in swift ships or 'skiffs of reed' (ix. 26), but this does not fit on to the previous description. Rather the picture of the sinner's fate begins with this line. Like the chip on the torrent he is swept to his doom (cf. Hos. x. 7). A curse rests on his

Drought and heat consume the snow waters : 19
So doth Sheol *those which* have sinned.
The womb shall forget him ; the worm shall feed sweetly 20
on him ;
He shall be no more remembered :
And unrighteousness shall be broken as a tree.
He devoureth the barren that beareth not ; 21
And doeth not good to the widow.
[A] He draweth away the mighty also by his power : 22
He riseth up, and no man is sure of life.

---

property. The third line seems to mean that he no longer visits his vineyards, since the curse has made them barren. The text, however, is flat, and several emendations have been proposed. Ley reads 'his way does not turn upwards' (deleting a consonant which occurs twice). We might better alter the pointing with Bickell, 'no treader turns towards his vineyards,' because there are no grapes to tread.

19. The verse is very irregular, the second line consisting simply of two words, and the first line being too long. The omission of **waters** improves sense and form, but the mischief seems to lie deeper.

consume: Heb. 'violently take away.'

20. There is no need to alter the first clause, though it is unusually short, the second gives an excellent sense in the English, but it is questionable if the Hebrew will bear this translation. Perhaps the word translated **shall feed sweetly on him** is a corruption of another word which originally belonged to the first clause. In that case we should point the word rendered **worm** differently, and translate 'His greatness shall be no more remembered' (so Bickell, followed by Budde and Duhm).

21. Probably it would be better to translate as in the marg. 'Even he that devoureth,' &c. The word does not seem happily chosen. Marshall ingeniously translates 'even he that keeps company with the barren,' Prov. xxix. 3, explaining that the adulterer 'goes where he is least likely to be detected.' The context suggests rather 'ill-treatment' of the childless woman, and this sense is expressed by a slightly different word.

22. Job's speech is here resumed. The margin is better: 'Yet *God* by his power maketh the mighty to continue : they rise up, when they believed not that they should live.' They recover, even from what they imagine will prove a fatal sickness.

23 *God* giveth them to be in security, and they rest thereon ;
And his eyes are upon their ways.
24 [M] They are exalted ; yet a little while, and they are gone ;
Yea, they are brought low, they are taken out of the way
as all other,
And are cut off as the tops of the ears of corn.
25 [A] And if it be not so now, who will prove me a liar,
And make my speech nothing worth ?

---

23. And his eyes : the marg. reads 'But his eyes,' as if God were watching them all the while with the intention of punishing, a quite inappropriate sense here. The meaning is that God graciously watches the ways of the wicked, to keep them from harm, cf. 'for then thou wouldest number my steps' (xiv. 16, see note).

24. The immediate impression of the verse is that the prosperity of the wicked is brief, and if so the verse, since the contrary of what Job maintains, must be a mitigating gloss. Usually it is explained of a swift and painless death, when they are full ripe for the reaping, so that their good fortune is unbroken to the end. This would give a quite satisfactory sense, cf. 'And in a moment they go down to Sheol' (xxi. 13). It is not easy, however, to believe that the verse means this. The first word, like several other things in this passage, is surprising Hebrew ; Klostermann by a slight alteration gets the sense 'Have just a little patience, and they are gone.' We might point 'His greatness' as in verse 20.

tops of the ears of corn : corn was reaped near the ear, not near the ground, as by us.

This speech reveals a deepened tenderness in Job's personal attitude to God, but on the wider question of God's moral government he occupies the same standpoint as before.

xxv. At this point we meet the very complicated problem of the apportionment of chs. xxv–xxvii among the speakers. According to the present text, Bildad utters the few brief sentences of which ch. xxv consists. Then Job replies and speaks to the end of ch. xxxi, Zophar taking no part in this cycle of the debate. Chs. xxix–xxxi fall outside the debate proper, just as ch. iii does. Ch. xxviii, as will be shown later, is not part of the original poem. We are accordingly confronted at present with chs. xxv–xxvii. The phenomena which excite attention are these : (*a*) Bildad's speech is unusually short ; (*b*) Job's reply contains a section (xxvi. 5–14) very like Bildad's speech ; (*c*) Zophar fails to speak ; (*d*) ch. xxvii has a title prefixed, which has no real parallel else-

Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said, 25

where in the middle of a speech belonging to the original poem (ch. xxix forming no real exception); (*e*) the greater part of ch. xxvii so completely contradicts Job's views as elsewhere expressed, that it seems very hard to believe that it can have formed part of his speech.

A large number of critics think that the brevity of Bildad's speech is intended by the poet to indicate that the case of the friends is exhausted, if so, it is not surprising that Zophar altogether fails to speak. This makes it impossible to regard the sections of ch. xxvii mentioned above as part of Zophar's missing speech; the critics who take this view accordingly delete them as a later addition, with the exception of a few scholars who defend their presence in a speech of Job. It cannot be denied that the poet may have intended to exhibit the defeat of the friends by this expedient; yet it is rather subtle, and the coincidence of other unusual phenomena strengthens the suspicion that the original arrangement has been disturbed. Zophar, we must remember, was not the man to keep silent so readily as Bildad, as one may see from the impetuous opening of his second speech. In view then of the great similarity between chs. xxv and xxvi. 5–14 it is a plausible suggestion that the latter really belongs to Bildad's speech, at present too short; and in view of the inconsistency of xxvii. 7–23 with Job's standpoint, it is plausible to assign most of this to Zophar. Attractive, however, as this may be, it has difficulties of its own when a detailed reconstruction is attempted. Usually xxvi. 5–14 is placed immediately after xxv. 6. Then xxvi. 1–4 immediately precedes xxvii. 2, and forms the opening of Job's reply, though Preiss and Duhm think xxvi. 2–4 is the opening of Bildad's speech. Since, however, xxvi. 2–4 is more naturally assigned to Job, this modification should probably be rejected. The view that Bildad's speech consists of xxv. 2–6, xxvi. 5–14 is criticized by Kuenen on the ground that xxvi. 5–14 would be suitable after xxv. 2, 3, but not after xxv. 6. This is a forcible objection. But it would be no improvement to wedge xxvi. 5–14 between xxv. 3 and xxv. 4. The speech ought to end with xxvi. 14, after so magnificent a peroration xxv. 4–6 would be anti-climax. Are we then to fall back on the present arrangement of chs. xxv, xxvi? It is true that xxvi. 5–14 is not in itself inappropriate on Job's lips. He has in earlier speeches asserted the greatness of God in a similar strain (ix. 4–13, xii. 7–25). But the case is different here. The description in xxvi. 5–14 connects neither with what goes before nor with what follows. It begins abruptly, and does not in any way lead on to xxvii. 2. Moreover, it is just as true that xxvi. 14 ought to end the speech if that speech is Job's as it is if the speech is Bildad's, but at present this is not

2 Dominion and fear are with him ;

the case. Nor has the description any special relevance to Job's position at this stage of the debate. The reply that he wishes to show that he can surpass the description just given by Bildad is not convincing. Had he wished to outshine the brief two verses devoted to it by Bildad, would he not at least have said, 'I grant all you affirm of God's greatness, but it strengthens your case not a whit'? And why the new title at the beginning of ch. xxvii, if there has been no dislocation?

So far then we are at a deadlock. Neither the present arrangement, nor the reconstruction of Bildad's speech as xxv. 2–6, xxvi. 5–14, nor its reconstruction as xxvi. 1–4, xxv. 2–6, xxvi. 5–14 seems satisfactory. The present writer therefore ventures to offer another suggestion. This is that Bildad's speech consisted originally of xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14. Kuenen has already been quoted to show that xxvi. 5–14 would suitably follow xxv. 2, 3. We may place it there, however, only on condition that nothing follows it. This involves the elimination of xxv. 4–6. It may seem arbitrary to strike out three such verses. But we may reconcile ourselves to this when we observe that they are a mere echo of xv. 14–16, cf. iv. 17–21. The verses are more in the manner of Eliphaz than of Bildad.

Marshall accepts the usual reconstruction of the speech, viz. xxv. 2–6, xxvi. 5–14, but makes the new suggestion that it belongs to Zophar, not to Bildad. He finds Bildad's third speech in xxiv. 18–21. It may be granted that the speech would suit Zophar, a rougher but also a deeper mind, better than Bildad. But xxiv. 18–21 is also too short for a speech, and is regarded by Marshall rather as an interruption replied to by Job (p. 88). This, however, spoils the symmetry of the debate, and an interruption in place of a set speech is otherwise unexampled. Besides, if a speech by Zophar follows, the explanation of the brevity of Bildad's speech by the exhaustion of the friends' case ceases to be available. The parallels between xxiv. 18–21 and earlier speeches of Bildad seem insufficient to bear the weight of the theory; in the case of xxiv. 20 = xviii. 13 both passages should probably be otherwise explained. It would, perhaps, be more satisfactory to connect xxiv. 18–21 with xxvii. 13–23. Ley does make Bildad's third speech consist of xxv. 1–6, xxiv. 18–20, xxvii. 13–23. But the combination of the two latter passages with xxv. 1–6 is quite unlikely. Moreover, why should Zophar have no speech? If those scholars are right who find Zophar's third speech embedded in xxvii. 7–23, neither Marshall's solution nor Ley's can be accepted. This question, however, may be deferred till we reach that point. Meanwhile we may be content to find Bildad's second speech in

He maketh peace in his high places.
Is there any number of his armies? 3
And upon whom doth not his light arise?

---

xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5, 4, and regard Job's reply as opening with xxvi. 2–4 and continued in xxvii. 2.

xxv. 1–6. Bildad replies by reference to God's might and majesty, the peace He has brought out of angelic contests, the number of His armies, the universal character of His government. [How can the woman-born be just before God? In His sight the heavenly bodies have no lustre or purity, how much less such a worm as man!]

xxvi. 1–4. Job sarcastically speaks of the helpful and instructive character of Bildad's speech. Who is the object of his instruction, and what is the source of his inspiration?

xxvi. 5–14. [Probably misplaced continuation of Bildad's speech.] The dead tremble before Him, for Sheol lies open to His gaze. The earth is hung over empty space. The clouds support without bursting their weight of water, and hide the throne of God. At the line of separation between light and darkness God has traced a circle [i. e. the rim of the vault of heaven] on the waters. The pillars supporting the sky tremble at His reproof. He stills the sea with His power and pierces the chaos-monster by His wisdom. He makes the sky bright by the wind, and His hand pierced leviathan. All this is the fringe of His ways, small is the whisper of Him that comes to us, far beyond us the thunder of His voice!

2. peace in his high places: the reference is to battles of the heavenly powers. But whether the 'war in heaven,' to which God puts an end, is a rebellion against Himself or a struggle between angelic factions is not clear. As we are reminded in verses 12, 13 and in ix. 13, Isa. li. 9, He vanquished the chaos-monster Tiamat and her brood. Conflicts between the angels are referred to in Dan. x. 13, 20, 21, xi. 1. Further reference to angelic irregularities and their punishment may be found in xxi. 22; Ps. lviii, lxxxii; Isa. xxiv. 21, 22.

3. armies: the host of heaven, including angels and stars, which were closely associated and often identified, perhaps also wind, rain, lightning and other elements that belong to the sky.

his light: God's light flashes on all things, nothing, even the most obscure and impenetrable, is concealed from Him. The reference is not to sunrise, the thought is the same as in Heb. iv. 13. On this follows admirably xxvi. 5, The dead tremble, for even Sheol, realm of darkness though it is, lies naked and exposed to His view.

4 [M] How then can man be just with God?
Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?
5 Behold, even the moon hath no brightness,
And the stars are not pure in his sight:
6 How much less man, that is a worm!
And the son of man, which is a worm!

26 [A] Then Job answered and said,
2 How hast thou helped him that is without power!
How hast thou saved the arm that hath no strength
3 How hast thou counselled him that hath no wisdom,
And plentifully declared sound knowledge!
4 To whom hast thou uttered words?

---

4. It has been suggested in the introductory remarks that verses 4–6 are a gloss, since it is not merely difficult to fit them into a tenable reconstruction, but they simply repeat, with trifling variation, the words of Eliphaz xv. 14–16, cf. iv. 17–21. Thus we are able to bring xxvi. 5 into immediate connexion with xxv. 3.

5. In xv. 15 Eliphaz had said 'the heavens are not clean in his sight.' His imitator makes a couplet out of this by enumerating moon and stars separately. Physical brightness and ethical purity are not sharply distinguished here. Moon and stars were not mere physical masses, but 'bodies celestial,' animated like other 'bodies' by spirits.

6. Unfortunately **worm** has to do duty here as a rendering of two Hebrew words.

xxvi. At this point Job's speech begins. Probably verses 1–4 should be placed immediately before xxvii. 2, this being preferable to the view of Preiss and Duhm, that verses 2–4 formed the introduction to Bildad's speech and ought therefore to be inserted before xxv. 2.

3. plentifully: the irony would be more biting if Bildad's speech had consisted merely of the five verses assigned to him in the present text. But it is sufficiently appropriate if it consisted of sixteen verses, for then Job would mean, In your elaborate description, how little there is to the purpose! It would in any case be absurd to argue on the basis of this expression that Bildad's speech must have been a short one. That is not a question to be settled by such trivialities.

4. To think of *your* teaching *me*! you must have been inspired!

And whose spirit came forth from thee?
They that are deceased tremble 5
Beneath the waters and the inhabitants thereof.
Sheol is naked before him, 6
And Abaddon hath no covering.
He stretcheth out the north over empty space, 7

Again very biting if Bildad's speech consisted of the poor five verses at present assigned to him, and three of these borrowed from Eliphaz. Once more, however, appropriate also after xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14; such heavenly lore, Job scoffs, points to a heavenly origin.

To whom: some translate 'with whom,' i. e. by whose help. The improved parallelism is too dearly bought.

5. Here Bildad's speech is resumed after xxv. 3. He has just said God's light shines on all, now he illustrates this by the deepest darkness of all. Eliphaz had condemned the thought that the exalted God could not see through the thick cloud men's doings on the earth. Bildad affirms that God's penetrating gaze strikes down through the sea to the gloomy underworld itself. As His light flashes into it the scared spirits cower beneath it.

They that are deceased: marg. 'The shades,' Heb. 'The Rephaim.' The word is often thought to mean 'the weak,' and to have been used as a name for the feeble spirits of the dead, pale, bloodless shadows of their old selves. The Rephaim are also mentioned as a race of giants (Deut. ii. 11, 20), and some think the giants, as the oldest race, which first went down to Sheol, came to be regarded as pre-eminently the inhabitants of Sheol, and thus the name came to include all the shades. In that case it would have nothing to do with the idea of 'weakness.' The theory is not quite easy; at the same time it would be an advantage to think here of 'the giants' long ago worsted in their battle with God and thrust down to Sheol. That the feeble shades should shrink from God's light is not to be wondered at; even those mighty giants, who had once done battle with Him, writhe under it.

and the inhabitants thereof: probably the great sea-monsters are specially in the author's mind. Bickell and Duhm read 'who have their dwellings beneath the waters,' which is, perhaps, an improvement.

6. Cf. Prov. xv. 11, 'Sheol and Abaddon are before Yahweh.' For 'Abaddon,' marg. 'Destruction,' cf. also xxviii. 22, xxxi. 12, Ps. lxxxviii. 11. According to Ps. cxxxix. 8 Yahweh's presence is to be found in Sheol, here it is stripped to His view.

7. It has been very commonly thought that the **north** here

And hangeth the earth upon nothing.
8 He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds;
And the cloud is not rent under them.
9 He closeth in the face of his throne,
And spreadeth his cloud upon it.
10 He hath described a boundary upon the face of the waters,
Unto the confines of light and darkness.

---

means the northern heavens, especially the pole-star and the stars that cluster about it (so, among our own scholars, Davidson and Marshall). Elsewhere, however, the sky is supposed to hang over the earth. The parallelism also suggests that **the north** here refers to earth, not to heaven. The north was to the Jews the region of great mountains, how wonderful that all their weight should rest on nothing! The second line may mean that the earth is suspended from nothing, or more probably that it is suspended over nothing. It is not the thought that it is free of all support. It is supported from above, but has no support beneath, it hangs over empty space.

8. From Sheol (verse 6) his description mounts to earth (verse 7), now it mounts again to the sky. The clouds are like water-skins; though charged with water they do not burst.

9. The text seems to mean that God conceals His throne by the clouds so that men cannot see it. It would be possible also to take the word translated **throne** to mean 'full moon,' the reference would then be to eclipses, not to mere clouding over of the moon. Duhm points the word translated **face of** differently, and renders 'He sets firm the pillars of His throne.' The sense **closeth in** is unusual.

10. According to Babylonian cosmology the earth was regarded as a disk floating on an ocean, 'the great deep,' and thus completely surrounded by water; on the surface of the waters that thus encircled the earth rested the great dome of the over-arching firmament. Within this dome is the realm of light, without it is the realm of darkness. **The confines of light and darkness** means the boundary line where the two realms touch, i. e. the horizon. Originally in the time of primaeval chaos, according to Gen. i. 2, darkness was over the whole face of the deep. Then light was created, and darkness and light were separated. There, however, light and darkness are identified with day and night. Here, apparently, the division is local, within the circle is the region of light, without it the region of darkness.

The pillars of heaven tremble 11
And are astonished at his rebuke.
He stirreth up the sea with his power, 12
And by his understanding he smiteth through Rahab.
By his spirit the heavens are garnished; 13
His hand hath pierced the swift serpent.

---

11. The pillars of heaven are the mountains. The rim of the celestial vault rests on **the face of the waters** as already explained. Within this encircling ocean is the earth, and from it spring the mountains which near the outer edge of the earth are high enough to reach and support the firmament at various points. Thus the full weight of the dome does not rest on the outer ocean, part rests on the mountains, just as a roof may be supported by pillars as well as by walls. Mighty though these giant mountains are, they tremble when God rebukes them. Like the temple threshold beneath Isaiah's feet at the voice of the seraphim, so they rock at the rebuke of God. The **rebuke** refers to the crashing peals of thunder. So in the description of the thunderstorm in Ps. xxix we read, 'He maketh them also to skip like a calf; Lebanon and Sirion like a young wild-ox.' Cf. ix. 6; Ps. xviii. 10–15.

12. stirreth up: marg. 'stilleth.' In Jer. xxxi. 35, Isa. li. 15 the word is used in the sense 'to stir up,' and this rendering is adopted here by the majority of commentators. The reference is to the contest of Yahweh with the chaos-monster (see note on vii. 12, ix. 13), and if we translate 'stirreth up' the allusion is to the inciting of the monster to battle, if we render 'stilleth' its subjugation is in the poet's mind. The latter is favoured not only by the parallelism, but by the reference to power, since it needed no power to incite Rahab, though confidence to do this would be given by consciousness of power. **The sea** is 'the deep' of Gen. i. 2, *t^ehom*, identical with Tiamat, here called Rahab.

smiteth through Rahab: see ix. 13; Isa. li. 9; Ps. lxxxix. 10. In His conflict God did not rely on sheer force alone, but also on His wisdom, similarly Marduk in the Babylonian myth.

13. If the text is right the first line means that the breath of God makes the sky clear and bright, by blowing away the dark clouds that shroud it in gloom. The LXX read a different text, 'the bars of heaven shudder at Him,' but though Gunkel accepts this, it is questionable if any suitable meaning can be imposed on it.

swift serpent: marg. 'fleeing,' or 'gliding.' This serpent is identical with 'leviathan' in iii. 8; cf. also Isa. xxvii. 1.

14 Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways:
And how small a whisper do we hear of him!
But the thunder of his power who can understand?

---

14. All this is only the fringe of the mystery of the universe, and all we hear, marvellous though it is, is but a whisper, a faint far-off murmur of God's working. We have no senses by which to apprehend the mighty forces that He controls; they are the rolling thunder that would deafen us; but mercifully we stand at the outermost edge, where the thunder at the centre floats softly to us as a still small voice.

In this speech, xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14, if it is rightly assigned to Bildad, we have the familiar assertion of the incomprehensible greatness of God, as a rebuke to Job's criticism of His government. Job's reply opens with xxvi. 2–4, and scornfully flings aside the rhetoric, which contributes no helpful explanation of his difficulties. Job has said 'God rules the world unrighteously,' how irrelevant Bildad's reply, God is all-powerful, far beyond our understanding!

xxvii. It has already been mentioned that this chapter includes much which, in the judgement of most scholars, cannot have been uttered by Job. There is no difficulty about verses 4–6, but verses 7–23 raise objections of the most serious kind. Job here abandons the position he has held throughout the debate and adopts that of the friends. In verses 7–10 he describes the hopeless case of the ungodly, and says that God will not hear his cry. But it has been his own complaint hitherto that God would not hear his cry; is it credible that he should assert that God would treat the ungodly as He had in fact treated him? Would he have made the damaging admission that he and the godless belonged to the same category after such passionate protestations of innocence? Here he asserts the miserable fate of the wicked, though in chs. xxi and xxiv he has dwelt upon their prosperity and the lack of any retribution. It is no adequate reply to say that Job here rises to a truer view. In the context immediately preceding he has charged God with taking away his right and embittering his soul. And in his later utterances he still complains that he cries to God but receives no answer, that God is persecuting him and will bring him to his death (xxx. 20–23). Moreover, such a denial of his former assertions is altogether unmotived. We may conclude with much confidence that verses 7–10 form no part of Job's speech.

In the rest of the chapter, verses 11–23, we have the same contradiction of views, which Job has previously defended. Here again he asserts the unmixed calamities which will overtake the wicked and his posterity, though in chs. xxi and xxiv he had said

[M] And Job again took up his parable, and said, 27

that right to his death the wicked continued in prosperity. And not content with denying his previous positions, he represents himself (verse 11) as instructing the three friends, who had all along maintained what he now says for the first time, and is sufficiently shameless to twit them with folly (verse 12), though at last he has come to agree with them. It has been said that Job, having won his case against the friends, now abandons the one-sided position forced on him by the controversy and states the position as it really exists. This is an astonishing line of defence. For it means that Job gives up the arguments that have been victorious against the friends, adopts the views he has demolished, and calls the friends fools because they do not see the very things which throughout the debate they have consistently affirmed. As neither Job nor the poet have done anything to make such an intellectual somersault credible, we may safely reject so desperate an expedient. It might have been possible, if Job had explained that he had perhaps expressed himself too sweepingly, and had then proceeded to make a balanced statement, dealing out even-handed justice to both sides. But this is just what he does not do. To say that he modifies his former statements is a grotesque under-statement, he bluntly contradicts them. And so far from attempting to reach a balanced view, he is just as sweeping in his affirmation of the evil fate of the godless as previously he had been sweeping in his denial. Nor can we suppose that Job would have argued, You have seen the evil fate of the wicked, why then do you think so foolishly about me? He could not have invited the crushing retort, Yes, it is just because we have seen the calamity of the wicked that from your calamity we judge you to be wicked. And can we seriously think of Job, after the experience he had suffered, saying, 'If his children be multiplied it is for the sword'? Others have said that Job is now attacking the friends with their own weapons: On your own showing the fate of the wicked is terrible, learn that this will be your fate for your wicked slanders against me. This artificial explanation must be altogether rejected; it is read into the passage, not extracted from it or even suggested by anything in it. It is clear from all this that verses 7–23 cannot be assigned to Job. As the descriptions of the woes of the ungodly are just of the same character as are elsewhere uttered by the friends, it is natural to suppose that here, too, it is one of the friends and not Job that is speaking. Since, according to the present arrangement, Zophar is silent in the third round of the debate, the most obvious suggestion is that here we have a part of his missing speech. Kennicott, in fact, long ago suggested that verses 13–23 should be assigned to him. It has often been urged against this that the poet wished to indicate by the brevity of

2 [A] As God liveth, who hath taken away my right;

Bildad's speech that the case of the friends was exhausted, and therefore no speech is to be expected from Zophar. If, however, we are right in assuming that Bildad's speech originally consisted of xxv. 2, 3, xxvi. 5–14 (see p. 232) this objection loses its force. Probably then we should assign verses 7–10 and verses 13–23 to Zophar, though verses 8–10 may with some plausibility be regarded as a gloss (see note on verse 8). It might be plausibly objected to this that we hardly expect Zophar to be repeating at the end of the third cycle of the debate that which was the theme of all the speakers in the second. Yet when we look more closely there is a beautiful symmetry here. In their first speeches the friends say, God is great, just, and wise; in their second speeches they say, It fares ill with the wicked. In the third cycle Eliphaz drives home the personal accusation to Job. Their case is now exhausted, but the poet's device for continuing the debate is not to let Bildad and Zophar repeat the personal charges, but to let Bildad repeat the general theme of the first set of speeches, and Zophar the general theme of the second set. The only alternative view would be that the portions here assigned to Zophar are a later insertion, and this is the opinion of several scholars, including Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Dillmann. It is obviously a preferable course to retain the passages rather than to strike them out, and since they exactly fit Zophar's standpoint, and there is no reason why he should not speak, the solution here adopted seems best. Job's reply to Bildad has been largely lost. So far we have seen that it consisted of xxvi. 2–4, xxvii. 2–6. Following this was probably a description of God's misgovernment, as in xxi and xxiv. Of this verse 12 is the conclusion. As Job draws the picture he appeals to the consciousness of the friends that he is right. They, too, have seen it, why then so foolishly maintain the contrary? That the speech ended with verse 12 is confirmed by the similar ending xxi. 34, and to a less degree by that in xxiv. 25. The only other fragment of the speech that may have been preserved is verse 11, which may well have introduced the description. This is preferable to making verse 11 part of Zophar's speech, which would involve the change of 'you' into 'thee.' The rest of the speech containing the description itself was probably eliminated because it shocked orthodox feeling too deeply.

Marshall thinks verses 7–23 can be regarded as uttered by Job if we assume that the debate once ended here and that the poet wished Job to 'come out right at last.' The former assumption removes the objection caused by Job's subsequent utterances, but the present writer is unable to accept it. And we should still have the difficulty caused by the earlier part of the chapter. And

And the Almighty, who hath vexed my soul;
(For my life is yet whole in me,
And the spirit of God is in my nostrils;) 3

---

all the other difficulties remain. Job does not come out right; he simply asserts the friends' view in the same extreme form in which he had previously asserted the opposite.

xxvii. 1–6. Job [continuing the speech begun xxvi. 2–4] affirms by the life of God, who has robbed him of his right, that the utterance he is about to make, in full possession of his powers, is true. He will in no wise admit the friends to be in the right, but will maintain his innocence to the last.

xxvii. 11, 12. He will teach them God's ways. [Here there seems to have followed a description of God's action on the lines of chs. xxi, xxiv, but probably even bolder, and hence suppressed.] They have themselves seen it, why so foolishly deny it?

xxvii. 7–10. [Zophar] expresses the wish that his enemy may fare as the godless, who has no hope when his life comes to an end, for God will not hear his cry in distress.

xxvii. 13–23. [Zophar] describes the portion of the godless. His children are destroyed by sword, famine and pestilence; his wealth shall be taken from him and given to the righteous; he is himself overtaken with terrors and swept to destruction by God.

xxvii. **1**. This verse is probably a later insertion, though if the whole of xxv, xxvi really belongs to Bildad, then it would simply be an alteration of the usual formula 'And Job answered and said' occasioned by the dislocation in ch. xxvi.

2–4. The R. V. rightly prints verse 3 as a parenthesis. The formula of oath is contained in verse 2, its content in verse 4. It is remarkable that, while Job swears by the life of God, he should assert so firmly the unrighteousness of His dealings with him. The parenthesis seems to mean, I am still myself, have not lost my mental energy; disease may have captured the outworks, but the fortress remains my own. The point of it is that his solemn declaration is not to be regarded as a morbid utterance, but one made with the fullest consciousness of all that it means. There is no need, with Duhm, to place verse 3 after verse 5, though it would be suitable enough there. Several scholars translate as in the marg. 'All the while my breath is in me, And the spirit of God is in my nostrils; Surely my,' &c. But Job does not mean that so long as he lives he will not speak falsely, but that his present assertion of innocence is true. It would be better in verse 4 to substitute, with the marg., the present for the future. **As God liveth**: Ley reads 'Lo!' or 'surely God hath

4 Surely my lips shall not speak unrighteousness,
Neither shall my tongue utter deceit.
5 God forbid that I should justify you:
Till I die I will not put away mine integrity from me.
6 My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go:
My heart shall not reproach *me* so long as I live.
7 Let mine enemy be as the wicked,
And let him that riseth up against me be as the unrighteous.
8 For what is the hope of the godless, though he get him gain,
When God taketh away his soul?

---

taken,' but this yields a weaker sense. **vexed my soul:** Heb. 'made my soul bitter.'

5. justify you: i. e. confess you to be in the right in your accusations against me. The second line means, I will not renounce the affirmation of my integrity, not, I will not cease to walk uprightly. Similarly **righteousness** in verse 6 has the judicial sense of 'innocence.' He means, I will never cease to plead 'Not Guilty.'

6. Better as in the marg. 'My heart doth not reproach *me for* any of my days.' Reviewing my whole life, I have nothing to regret.

7. Here probably Zophar is speaking. He is so convinced of the evil lot of the wicked that the fate he imprecates on the foe he most bitterly hates is that he may be as the godless. The point is not so much that he trusts misfortune will overwhelm his enemy—of course Zophar wishes that—but that the worst fate which can befall a man is that meted out to the wicked. So strong an assertion that the wicked are those most heavily punished is not very conceivable in Job's mouth.

8. though he get him gain: the marg. is better, 'when God cutteth him off, when he taketh away his soul.' The verb translated **taketh away** means 'draweth out,' a slightly different word would give the sense 'requireth' (cf. Luke xii. 20), and this is read by many scholars. The verse is on either view difficult, since it seems to postulate that the God-fearing has hope in his death, while the godless has none. This does not harmonize with the standpoint in the rest of the book, which assumes the old-fashioned Hebrew doctrine of the state after death, though the author himself seems to have turned with longing towards the thought of a happy future life. The text may need emendation; if we have it in its original form, we should perhaps regard

Will God hear his cry, 9
When trouble cometh upon him?
Will he delight himself in the Almighty, 10
And call upon God at all times?
I will teach you concerning the hand of God; 11
That which is with the Almighty will I not conceal.
Behold, all ye yourselves have seen it; 12
Why then are ye become altogether vain?
This is the portion of a wicked man with God, 13
And the heritage of oppressors, which they receive from the Almighty.
If his children be multiplied, it is for the sword; 14

---

verses 8–10 as a gloss by a reader, who held not only the traditional view of the lot of the ungodly, but also the later doctrine of a distinction, in their ultimate fate, between the righteous and the wicked, such as we find in Pss. xlix, lxxiii.

10. For the first line cf. xxii. 26[a].

at all times: if the text is right, the reference is to the experiences of life in general. The impression made by verses 8–10 is rather that the special crisis mentioned in verse 8 is intended throughout. Duhm reads 'If he call to Him, will He accept him?'

11. Probably this verse is part of Job's speech, introducing a description by Job of the immorality of God's government of the world, which was suppressed on account of its boldness (see p. 240).

12. It is quite incredible that Job should have uttered this verse in connexion with such a description of God's judgement on the wicked as we find in verses 13–23, seeing that all along he had maintained the opposite, so that the charge of folly would recoil on himself, while the friends had asserted what he now maintains, so that it would be sheer stupidity on his part to taunt them with the folly of denying what they had consistently affirmed. There is no reason for striking out the verse. The reference can only be to what they have seen of God's immoral government, and therefore must have come originally at the end of the description introduced by verse 11 (see p. 240).

13. The description that now follows probably belongs to Zophar's third speech (see pp. 238–240). The plurals in the second line should probably be corrected into singulars.

14. Job's own children were numerous and suddenly cut off,

And his offspring shall not be satisfied with bread.
15 Those that remain of him shall be buried in death,
And his widows shall make no lamentation.
16 Though he heap up silver as the dust,
And prepare raiment as the clay;
17 He may prepare it, but the just shall put it on,
And the innocent shall divide the silver.
18 He buildeth his house as the moth,
And as a booth which the keeper maketh.

---

how could the poet have been guilty of placing this line in the bereaved father's lips? Job's view of the glad life lived by the large family of the oppressor is to be found in xxi. 11. It is the friends who have made similar assertions to those in this verse, v. 4, xviii. 19, xx. 20.

multiplied: several render 'grow up.'

15. Sword and famine are now, as often, completed into a triad by the mention of pestilence, which is the sense **death** bears here (cf. Jer. xv. 2). It would be better to translate 'buried by death,' a gruesome way of saying that the pestilence slays them and disposes of the remains; in other words, they lie unburied, and the plague, which has killed them, works on to their decomposition.

his widows: this implies not only that he is a polygamist, but that when the calamities overtake his sons he is himself dead. His death, however, is not mentioned till a later point. It is much better to read with the LXX 'their widows.' The sons are rooted out, some by sword, others by famine, others by pestilence. Those who are killed by plague are not buried, and their widows do not raise the wail over them, cf. Jer. xxii. 10–19; Ps. lxxviii. 64. The plural in the latter passage has not influenced the LXX here, rather the plural has been altered into conformity with the other singular possessives. Cf. the ghastly description in Amos vi. 9, 10 (if through the corrupt text one can guess at the original meaning).

16. clay, like **dust,** expresses abundance.

18. moth: probably we should with most scholars read 'spider,' as the Syriac (cf. viii. 14). The LXX has combined the two readings.

booth: that is the frail structure made for the use of the night-watchman in a vineyard. It was not meant to be permanent, and so was roughly put together and flimsy in construction, cf. Isa. i. 8.

He lieth down rich, but he shall not be gathered ; 19
He openeth his eyes, and he is not.
Terrors overtake him like waters ; 20
A tempest stealeth him away in the night.
The east wind carrieth him away, and he departeth ; 21
And it sweepeth him out of his place.
For *God* shall hurl at him, and not spare : 22
He would fain flee out of his hand.
Men shall clap their hands at him, 23
And shall hiss him out of his place.

[W] Surely there is a mine for silver, 28

---

19. he shall not be gathered: the sense is not at all clear, perhaps the meaning is, not joined in burial with his ancestors. As the marg. says, '*Some ancient versions have*, shall do so no more.' This reading of the LXX and Syriac is now adopted by many. The second line may mean he wakes and is immediately destroyed, or he wakes and is rich no longer. If, as the words most naturally suggest, we have here, as in 2 Kings xix. 35 = Isa. xxxvii. 36, a bull, when he gets up next morning he will find himself dead, we can hardly make the poet responsible for it.

20. For 'like waters' Merx and some others read 'by day,' to correspond to 'in the night' in the next line.

21. The LXX, followed by Bickell, omits this and the two following verses, Budde omits 21, 22. The order is rather strange, but it is not necessary on that account to strike the verses out.

23. Possibly we should regard God as the subject, in which case we should compare for God's derision and anger Ps. ii. 4, 5 and Wisdom's mockery of the scorners, Prov. i. 24–33. The translation in the text, however, is supported by xxii. 19.

xxviii. This chapter is regarded by very many scholars as a later insertion. Since it opens with the word 'For' (so marg. correctly), a logical connexion with what precedes seems to be implied. No attempt to trace it has, however, been successful, and that whether the present arrangement of ch. xxvii is retained, or whether xxvii. 13–23 is omitted, or assigned to Zophar. Since something must have preceded, we might infer that the chapter is an excerpt from another poem. But Duhm has recently suggested a better solution. He gives reasons for supposing that

And a place for gold which they refine.

since the words 'Whence cometh wisdom [or 'where shall wisdom be found'] and where is the place of understanding?' occur as a refrain in the poem, they were therefore probably placed at the beginning. In that case it was natural that the poet should continue, 'For there is a mine for silver,' &c. While the formal difficulty created by 'For' is thus removed, the very theory which removes it favours the view that we have in this artistically constructed poem, not a section of the debate, but an independent composition. Quite apart from this, it is difficult to fit the chapter into the movement of the argument. Its theme is that man cannot attain wisdom, this being the possession of God alone. It is not easy to see the bearing of this on the question discussed. It would be more suitable in the mouth of one of the friends than in Job's mouth. For Job feels the problem press heavily on him, and is by no means inclined to accept the attitude here recommended. Before and after he chafes against the limitations imposed upon him, and will not submit to the doctrine that God's wisdom is incommunicable, and that man must cheerfully acquiesce in his inability to understand it. Only after the vision of God and the Divine speech does Job attain this settled resignation to the mystery of God's ways. And this suggests a further, and the decisive reason why Job cannot have uttered this part of the poem. If he had already reached the position here accepted, the speech of Yahweh would have been unnecessary. While the poem on Wisdom is in itself a very fine one, its insertion here spoils the artistic effect, and introduces an irrational element into the debate. Nor is it likely that those scholars are right who assign it to Zophar. Certainly it harmonizes better with the view of the friends, still it is only very slenderly connected with the debate, and has no point of attachment with what immediately precedes. It is also too serene in temper for Zophar, its calm and lofty tone contrasting strongly with the rabid violence of his speeches. If Duhm's suggestion is correct, the impression we get from it is that it is a poem complete in itself, not part of a larger whole. How it came to be inserted here is not clear. Perhaps a reader wished to indicate the futility of a debate which sought to understand a mystery reserved by God in His own counsel.

xxviii. 1–6, 9–11. [Where can wisdom be found?] For precious metals are to be found by man's persistent effort to penetrate the rocks by mines, where he lights the darkness and swings in mid-air without foothold, reaping the harvest of wealth below as grain harvest is reaped above. He cuts passages in the solid rocks, stops the streams from weeping into them, sees and brings to light the hidden treasure.

Iron is taken out of the earth, 2
And brass is molten out of the stone.
Man setteth an end to darkness, 3
And searcheth out to the furthest bound
The stones of thick darkness and of the shadow of death.

---

xxviii. 12, 7–8, 13–19. But where shall wisdom be found? No bird's eye has seen the path, no beast of prey has trodden it. Man does not know the way, nor can it be found in the land of the living. The deep and the sea confess that they do not possess it. No gold or jewel is precious enough to purchase it.

xxviii. 20–28. Whence then cometh wisdom, since it is hid from all living creatures, even the fowls of the air. Abaddon and Death have heard but a rumour. It is God alone, the All-seeing One, who knows its home. When He carried through the work of creation He created Wisdom and understood its inmost nature. To man He has appointed fear of the Lord as his wisdom.

xxviii. **1.** As already mentioned, the refrain 'Whence cometh wisdom and where is the place of understanding?' probably stood at the beginning of the poem as its theme. Then the poet naturally proceeds, 'For there is a mine for silver.' The line of thought is that other precious things have their home in the material universe, and however inaccessible it may be, men contrive to find the way. So, too, one may think that the skill and perseverance, which track the precious metals or the flashing jewels to their secret retreat, may carry through successfully the quest for Wisdom. Cf. Matthew Arnold, *Empedocles on Etna* (the passage beginning 'Look the world tempts our eye').

is: emphatic.

mine: *lit.* 'source.' This is the only passage in the O.T. where we have any detailed description of mining operations. Palestine, on account of its geological formation, is poor in minerals, though not wholly destitute, as we learn from Deut. viii. 9: 'a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.' There was a good deal of mining in neighbouring countries, especially in Egypt, but also on Lebanon, on the east of the Jordan, and in Idumaea. Whether the old mines in the Sinaitic Peninsula were still worked in the poet's time is doubtful. It is also uncertain whether he had actually visited the mines or knew of them only by hearsay.

2. brass: better 'copper.' **earth**: marg. 'dust.'

3. The miners set an end to darkness by driving shafts into the earth, and where the light of day can pierce no farther they dissipate the darkness with their lamps. Thus they penetrate to

4 He breaketh open a shaft away from where men sojourn ;
They are forgotten of the foot *that passeth by* ;
They hang afar from men, they swing to and fro.
5 As for the earth, out of it cometh bread :
And underneath it is turned up as it were by fire.
6 The stones thereof are the place of sapphires,

---

the utmost limits, and from the deepest gloom drag out the precious ore. Duhm reads 'Man searcheth the darkness to the utmost bound, Seeketh out the stones of thick darkness and of the shadow of death.'

4. The marg. reads, 'The flood breaketh out from where men sojourn ; *even the waters* forgotten of the foot ; they are minished, they are gone away from man.' The translation in the text probably gives the general sense, describing the miners plying their hazardous occupation. But the second line yields an unlikely sense. It is more probable that the reference should be to the fact that the miners, as they are suspended by a rope in the shaft, do not support themselves with the foot ; we might translate 'they hang without foot,' or, as we should say, 'without foothold.' Bickell has suggested that we should add the word *'ōr* 'light' after the somewhat similar word *gār*, thus getting the sense 'He breaketh open a shaft far from them that sojourn in light.' Ley's suggestion, that we should substitute *nēr* 'light' for *gār*, involves a slighter change and yields a neater phrase, 'He breaketh a shaft far from light.' Duhm's objections to the general sense are exaggerated, and his corrections accordingly unnecessary. Marshall prefers the margin to text, thinking that the flooding of a mine is described ; but for *gār* he reads *gir* 'lime,' rendering 'the stream burst in from the limestone.' The context, however, and general drift of the passage strongly favours the reference to the marvellous feats of man in his quest for treasure ; the thought of the flooding of the mine is less relevant, and verse 11 tells against it.

swing : marg. 'flit.'

5. Perhaps a contrast is intended between the quiet growth of the corn above and the wild overturning that goes on in the mines below. But is not the point rather that, just as man overturns the soil with the plough to win the harvest of golden grain, so he overturns it below to win the harvest of gold and gems, ruthless in his lust for gain ? We ought perhaps to read 'by fire' instead of 'as by fire,' the difference in the Hebrew being very slight. Fire was used in blasting the rocks. Budde unnecessarily regards verses 5, 6 as a later addition.

And it hath dust of gold.
That path no bird of prey knoweth, 7
Neither hath the falcon's eye seen it:
The proud beasts have not trodden it, 8

---

6. it hath dust of gold. It is not clear whether 'it' means 'the place,' or 'the sapphire' which in some cases has 'dust of gold' in it, i. e. iron pyrites. The marg. renders 'And he winneth lumps of gold.'

7. According to the present arrangement, the path unknown to the keen-sighted bird, untrodden by the beast of prey, is the path which man has cut into the earth in his search for treasure. Although Duhm speaks too strongly in calling this absurd, yet he is surely right in saying that the path here mentioned is that to the home of Wisdom. This is proved by verse 21, where the author alludes to its concealment from the eyes of all living and from the fowls of the air, as though this had already been expressly mentioned. Duhm accordingly suggests that here the refrain 'Whence cometh wisdom and where is the place of understanding?' should be inserted before it. But he has thereby created a new difficulty. For the description of mining is now abandoned for the new theme, that the birds and beasts do not know the way to the dwelling-place of Wisdom. How strange then that, after this theme has been developed for a couple of verses, the poet should suddenly swing back to a further description of mining. The difficulty lies to a certain extent against the present arrangement, in so far as these verses, asserting the inaccessibility to the birds and beasts of the mines sunk by man, interrupt the description of mining operations. The present writer would therefore suggest that verses 7, 8 are misplaced. If so, there is no need to insert the refrain before them, they should be simply inserted after it, i. e. they should immediately follow verse 12, where they are admirably in place.

The thought is not merely that, for all the keenness of their vision, the birds of prey or the beasts that hunt their quarry by night have never seen or trodden the way to Wisdom's abode. Birds and animals were supposed to know many things unknown to man, the wisdom of the serpent has, indeed, passed into a proverb. Hence it was not unreasonable for an ancient poet explicitly to rebut the suggestion that the beasts might know the home of Wisdom, since they knew so many of her secrets. But for all their mysterious lore, Wisdom herself lies beyond their reach.

falcon's: elsewhere the word is translated 'kite.'

8. proud beasts: Heb. 'sons of pride,' so also xli. 34.

Nor hath the fierce lion passed thereby.
9 He putteth forth his hand upon the flinty rock;
He overturneth the mountains by the roots.
10 He cutteth out channels among the rocks;
And his eye seeth every precious thing.
11 He bindeth the streams that they trickle not;
And the thing that is hid bringeth he forth to light.
12 But where shall wisdom be found?
And where is the place of understanding?
13 Man knoweth not the price thereof;
Neither is it found in the land of the living.
14 The deep saith, It is not in me:
And the sea saith, It is not with me.

---

9. This and the two following verses, completing the description of mining, follow fairly well on verse 6, it is, however, possible that originally they stood after verse 4, which would give a better sequence.

10, 11. Duhm makes the attractive suggestion that 10^b and 11^a should be transposed. The **channels** might be designed to carry off the water, but more probably they are 'passages' (so marg.) drilled through the rock in search of ore or gems.

that they trickle not: Heb. 'from weeping,' a vivid phrase, which might well have been put into the text rather than the marg. of the R.V. The reference is to means taken to prevent water from trickling into the mine and rendering it unworkable.

Duhm adds verse 24 here, supposing that it was accidentally removed from its original position to the opposite column. It would suit the context here very well, but the objection to its present position is rather hyper-critical.

12. Since in verse 20 the refrain runs 'Whence then cometh wisdom,' &c., it is a plausible suggestion that this was the original text here, and that **be found** has come in from verse 13. On the other hand, the present text is far more suitable to the context. The most inaccessible things are found by man, but where shall wisdom be found? Accordingly the text must be retained, and if uniformity is necessary, verse 20 must be conformed to verse 12. On this verse it is probable that verses 7, 8 originally followed.

13. the price thereof: the LXX reads 'the way thereof,' as in verse 23, and is rightly followed by most scholars. 'Price' would suit the description in verses 15–19, but is out of place here.

14. Not birds and beasts, nor yet man alone, are unfamiliar with

It cannot be gotten for gold, 15
Neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof.
It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, 16
With the precious onyx, or the sapphire.
Gold and glass cannot equal it: 17
Neither shall the exchange thereof be jewels of fine gold.
No mention shall be made of coral or of crystal: 18
Yea, the price of wisdom is above rubies.

---

the abode of Wisdom. Even the hoary deep, 'that coucheth beneath,' does not possess it, though it waged primaeval warfare with God. The clumsy repetition in the second line of the translation is not found in the Hebrew.

15. Bickell, Hatch, Dillmann, and Budde strike out verses 15–20. In this they are partly supported by the LXX, which omits verses 14–19, but on this little stress can be laid. Budde's argument, that we have had the firm substance of the upper earth (verses 1–11), then the deep and the sea (verse 14), now we must have the air (verse 21) and the underworld (verse 22), and therefore that all between verse 14 and verse 21 is an insertion, may be set aside. For we have already seen that the reference to the inability of the fowls of the air to find wisdom has been mentioned in verse 7, and that verse 21 simply sums up the general conclusion from what has been stated. There is more force in the objection that the theme of the chapter is that wisdom cannot be found, while here the thought is of wisdom's incomparable worth. It is not necessary, however, to interpret the verses in this way. The thought is not that wisdom is very precious, but that man cannot procure it. He may procure desirable things by labour or by purchase. But all his labour does not bring him wisdom, for not all the ways he cuts into the treasure-bearing rocks can yield him this treasure. Nor yet can he gain it by purchase, for when he has torn earth's richest treasures from her mines, they will not be of value enough to buy it. It is further urged that it is a bare catalogue of gems, of little poetical worth, and imitated from Prov. iii. 14, 15, viii. 10, 11. It is lost labour to discuss questions of taste, the present writer has a much higher estimate of the poetical beauty of the passage. Possibly the present text has some variants, e.g. 16^a and 19^b, 17^a and 19^a.

gold: marg. 'treasure.' The word probably means refined gold.

16. onyx: marg. 'beryl.'

17. jewels: marg. 'vessels.'

18. rubies: marg. 'red coral' or 'pearls.'

19 The topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it,
Neither shall it be valued with pure gold.
20 Whence then cometh wisdom?
And where is the place of understanding?
21 Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living,
And kept close from the fowls of the air.
22 Destruction and Death say,
We have heard a rumour thereof with our ears.
23 God understandeth the way thereof,
And he knoweth the place thereof.
24 For he looketh to the ends of the earth,
And seeth under the whole heaven;
25 To make a weight for the wind;

---

20. Again the urgent question, introducing such answer as the poet can give.

21. The reason why the quest is still pursued; the living creatures on earth and the birds that fly above it are alike ignorant of the way (verses 7, 8).

22. Destruction: Heb. 'Abaddon,' see note on xxvi. 6. Death and the underworld know as much and as little as the rest of creation. They have heard but a rumour; so the poet himself says of man's knowledge of God, 'How small a whisper do we hear of Him' (xxvi. 14).

23. The meaning is not simply that God knows, but that He and no other knows.

24. As mentioned above, Duhm places this verse after verse 11. Budde strikes it out. The reason is that the verse expresses the thought that Wisdom has a home on earth, which is revealed to the eye of God. This is supposed to contradict the teaching of the rest of the chapter, that she is not to be found on earth. But perhaps this presses the language unduly. Some connect, as the R. V. apparently does, with verse 25 and thus avoid the difficulty. But more probably verse 25 and verse 26 go closely together.

25. To make: marg. 'When he maketh,' but 'When he made' would be better. This and the following verse are a preparation for verse 27. At the time of creation God searched out and established Wisdom.

a weight for the wind. God weighed out the due quantity of air for the world. Light though air is, yet its weight is seen to be very real when we experience it in the form of 'wind.'

Yea, he meteth out the waters by measure.
When he made a decree for the rain, 26
And a way for the lightning of the thunder:
Then did he see it, and declare it; 27
He established it, yea, and searched it out.
[M] And unto man he said, 28
Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom;
And to depart from evil is understanding.

[A] And Job again took up his parable, and said, 29

26. The second line is borrowed from xxxviii. 25.

27. declare: the meaning may be that God named the name of Wisdom in the sense that He expressed her qualities. The marg. translates 'recount.'

established: the meaning is uncertain, perhaps it signifies 'created.'

28. Since this stands distinguished from the wisdom spoken of in this chapter in two respects, viz. that it is a religious, not an intellectual thing, and is attainable by man, we must either treat the verse as a later addition, or strain the language to mean, The fear of God is the only wisdom man can attain. It is surprising, after the poet has so emphatically denied wisdom to all but God, that he should speak of the fear of the Lord as wisdom, since that is not possible to God, but only to the creature. All the more when wisdom has been used in the sense of that faculty by which God created the universe, the reason which finds expression in the world, it should be defined as a certain attitude of man to God. If we retain the verse the meaning must be, God has appointed the fear of the Lord as the principle to guide man's ways, in substitution for the principle by which He directs His own.

xxix–xxxi. If Zophar's third speech ended with xxvii. 23, and xxviii is a later insertion, then xxix–xxxi must constitute Job's reply to Zophar. Yet while formally it may be so regarded, really the debate is over. The utmost Zophar can do is to repeat what has already been refuted. Why waste more words on him or his friends? And just as the debate had been preceded by Job's soliloquy in ch. iii, so now it is followed by these chapters, also wholly personal in their character. His former life in God's favour passes before his mind in all its circumstances of happiness, of honour, and of benevolence to others. On this follows the bitter contrast in the present, contempt, pain, and the settled enmity of God. But while God persecutes and men condemn

2 Oh that I were as in the months of old,
As in the days when God watched over me;
3 When his lamp shined upon my head,
And by his light I walked through darkness;
4 As I was in the ripeness of my days,
When the secret of God was upon my tent;

---

him, he utters in proud confidence his noble vindication of his past life; his misery may brand him as a sinner, but he will assert his integrity and confront God in consciousness of his innocence.

xxix. 1-6. Job longs that he might once again live as in the old days, when God watched over him and guided his steps, when he was in his ripe age, guarded by God's presence, with his children around him, and abundant prosperity attended him.

xxix. 7-10, 21-25. Then, when he went to the assembly, the young retired abashed from his presence, the aged rose to meet him. The princes ceased to speak and waited for his counsel. His word was final, and men waited for it as eagerly as for the latter rain. His cheerfulness gave them courage and comfort, and his decision was their law.

xxix. 11-17. For those who heard of him blessed him, and those who saw him testified of him, since he helped the poor and the orphan, succoured the perishing and the widow. He was justice incarnate, making good the defects of others, helping the stranger to his rights, smiting the unrighteous and forcing him to let go of his victim.

xxix. 18-20. So he looked forward to long and untroubled life, his root drinking the waters, his branch quickened by the dew, honour and strength for his portion.

xxix. **1.** Probably ran originally 'And Job answered and said.'

2. The old fellowship with God he feels to have been real. God's watchfulness was also real, a tender care, not the malignant watchfulness of which he has earlier in the debate complained. He turns with wistful longing to those happier days.

3. upon: marg. 'above.'

4. ripeness of my days: Heb. 'my days of autumn.' Budde thinks the word could bear an unfavourable sense only, and that the text must be wrong. But this seems unnecessary.

secret: marg. 'counsel,' or 'friendship.' The Hebrew is strange; we should probably read, with a slight alteration, 'when God put a hedge about my tent' (cf. i. 10). There is probably an allusion to the Prologue here and in the following verse.

When the Almighty was yet with me,
And my children were about me ;
When my steps were washed with butter;
And the rock poured me out rivers of oil !
When I went forth to the gate unto the city,
When I prepared my seat in the street,
The young men saw me and hid themselves,
And the aged rose up and stood ;
The princes refrained talking,
And laid their hand on their mouth ;
The voice of the nobles was hushed,
And their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth.
For when the ear heard *me*, then it blessed me ;
And when the eye saw *me*, it gave witness unto me :
Because I delivered the poor that cried,
The fatherless also, that had none to help him.
The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me :

---

5. The companionship of God was his highest good, then the companionship of his children.

6. rock: the barren rock yielded him rivers of oil, a strong exaggeration to express the bounty of nature to him. Possibly we should think rather of the oil-presses in the rock, but the sense is tamer, if less hyperbolical. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 13.

7. Here Job appears as one who shared in the government of the city, near which his estate would lie. He does not live on a 'ranch,' a life isolated from others of his rank.

9, 10. Discussion ceased on Job's arrival, even the highest waiting for his word. Budde seems to be clearly right in the view that verses 21–25 should follow verse 10. The present arrangement breaks off abruptly the description of Job in the assembly.

hushed: Heb. 'hid,' but probably the word has been introduced from verse 8 by a slip in place of the original text, which however is no doubt approximately reproduced by the R. V.

11. Here Job speaks of his reputation among the people generally on account of his kindness to the suffering and needy.

12. Cf. Ps. lxxii. 12. He had not neglected Lazarus at his gate.

And I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.
14 I put on righteousness, and it clothed me:
My justice was as a robe and a diadem.
15 I was eyes to the blind,
And feet was I to the lame.
16 I was a father to the needy:
And the cause of him that I knew not I searched out.
17 And I brake the jaws of the unrighteous,
And plucked the prey out of his teeth.
18 Then I said, I shall die in my nest,
And I shall multiply my days as the sand:
19 My root is spread out to the waters,
And the dew lieth all night upon my branch:
20 My glory is fresh in me,
And my bow is renewed in my hand.
21 Unto me men gave ear, and waited,
And kept silence for my counsel.
22 After my words they spake not again;

---

14. it clothed me: better as in marg. 'it clothed itself in me,' as we might say, became incarnate in me.

diadem: marg. 'turban.'

16. The translation in the text is to be preferred to the marg. 'the cause which I knew not.'

18. in: marg. 'beside,' Heb. 'with.'

the sand: rather, as in the marg., 'the phoenix,' the bird which, according to the story told to Herodotus in Egypt, lived five hundred years, and having burnt itself in its nest rose to a new life from the ashes. Hence it was naturally an illustration of very long life. Many scholars translate, however, as in the text.

19, 20 form a beautiful close to the description, though the present conclusion with verse 25 is also fine.

21. As already mentioned, verses 21–25 should follow verse 10. When Job entered the assembly the aged rose in his honour (verse 8), the discussion ceased, even the most distinguished keeping silence (verses 9, 10); they waited till Job had spoken and then felt they could add nothing to his decisive word (verses 21, 22).

And my speech dropped upon them.
And they waited for me as for the rain ; 23
And they opened their mouth wide *as* for the latter rain.
If I laughed on them, they believed *it* not ; 24
And the light of my countenance they cast not down.
I chose out their way, and sat *as* chief, 25
And dwelt as a king in the army,
As one that comforteth the mourners.

---

22. dropped: like rain, as the next verse explains. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 2; Isa. lv. 10, 11.

23. Cf. Prov. xvi. 15. The latter rain, falling in March and April, is very eagerly anticipated by the farmer, on account of its importance for his crops. Klostermann reads 'like the clods for the latter rain' (cf. Joel i. 17), this is supported by the LXX 'like thirsty ground.'

24. The translation in the text yields a sense too overstrained; the great man's smile could hardly seem an incredible favour. The margin gives a much better sense, 'I smiled on them when they had no confidence.' This, however, does not suit the better attested reading ($w^e l\bar{o}$ instead of $l\bar{o}$), which requires either the translation in the text, or 'I laughed on them and they were not confident,' which is the opposite of what we expect. We should probably, with Budde, strike out the negative, 'I laughed on them and they were confident.' The second line means, according to the text, that the dejection of others did not disturb the brightness of Job's outlook. The expression, however, is strange, for while we may speak of casting down the face, we can hardly speak of casting down the light of the face. Bickell, followed by Budde and Duhm, has made the tempting suggestion that we should read 'And the light of my countenance comforted the mourners,' taking the last words from verse 25, where the third line is inappropriate.

25. It is not clear whether **their way** means the way which led to them, or the way which they should tread, i. e. their course of action. Since choosing implies the selection between alternative courses, the latter is perhaps to be preferred. If the former is adopted it would probably be better to translate, 'When I chose out the way to them, I sat as chief.' The third line is out of place here, and probably stood for the most part at the end of the preceding verse.

30 But now they that are younger than I have me in derision,
Whose fathers I disdained to set with the dogs of my flock.

---

xxx. 1. Job complains of the derision of those younger than himself, sons of the lowest among the people.

xxx. 2–8. (Probably misplaced portion of description of troglodytes in xxiv. 5 ff.) The strength of their hand fails from famine; they are fed and warmed by the poorest food and fuel, hounded from civilization like thieves, forced to dwell in gloomy valleys and in holes, coupling under the bushes, children of the nameless, scourged from the cultivated soil.

xxx. 9–15. (Following on verse 1.) Job is the subject of their lampoons, and the object of their loathing. God has rendered him unstrung, the victim of unchecked calamities. He is like a city besieged, all ways of escape cut off, with the enemy at last pouring through a breach. He is overwhelmed with terrors, and his welfare is gone.

xxx. 16–31. Now he suffers incessant pain, his body emaciated and swollen. God has thrust him in the mire, and will not hear his cry; He cruelly persecutes him, catches him up in the whirlwind and dissolves him in the storm. He knows that God means to slay him. Yet the certainty of destruction does not repress his cry. He wept for the trouble of others. His own hopes have been blighted. His inward tumult does not cease, he goes mourning, a fit companion of jackals and ostriches. His skin is black and falling off, his bones fevered. His music has turned to wailing.

xxx. **1–8.** According to the present text of verses 1–8 Job begins the description of the sad reverse of his fortunes with a bitter complaint that he is mocked by those younger than himself, sons of men whom he would have scorned to set with his sheep-dogs. For they were men without vigour and therefore useless to him. Then follows a description of the wretched condition in which the outcasts live. It is possible that scholars generally have been right in accepting this arrangement. Yet it is not easy. It is natural that Job should set against the honour, once paid by princes, the mockery he now suffers from outcasts, though the tone of disdain in verse 1 is unlike him, one might say unworthy of him, and leaves a painful impression. But why should he diverge to explain that they were useless to him? Besides, it is not at all clear in what follows whether it is the fathers or the children of whom he is speaking. We naturally suppose that it is the former, and that Job is explaining their lack of vigour by the poverty of their diet and the miserable conditions

Yea, the strength of their hands, whereto should it profit 2
me?
Men in whom ripe age is perished.
They are gaunt with want and famine; 3

in which they live. When, however, we come to verse 9 we see from comparison with verse 1 that it is the children who have been spoken of; but the transition has not been made plain. Further, were these outcasts, scourged out of society into the wilderness, in a position to venture into the open and insult Job in the manner described? When we look at the passage apart from verse 1, the impression it makes is not one of contempt for their abject condition, but of pity for their misery. Hence the greater part would have been better suited to one of Job's delineations of human wretchedness than to the picture he is painting of his own distress, from which he is diverted at a surprisingly early point. When, lastly, we notice that apparently the same outcasts are introduced here as in xxiv. 5 ff., it is a plausible suggestion that we have here a misplaced section of that description. The objection to the identification, that there they are objects of pity, here of contempt, is, even if true, not decisive, for Job may have regarded them with mingled feelings. But if we detach verse 1, the objection falls away, and even with the present text several scholars think the identification is correct. The present writer is accordingly inclined to believe that originally verses 2–8 or verses 3–8 stood in connexion with xxiv. 5 ff. The first verse may, as Duhm thinks, be an insertion designed to connect these verses with their present context. In that case those who are mentioned in verses 9, 10 as making Job the subject of their lampoons and the object of their insults are those who in earlier days treated him with such respect. This is open to a double objection. It is not likely that those dignified senators would descend to such treatment of Job. Moreover, when xxix. 21–25 has been inserted after xxix. 10 (and Duhm accepts this), the reference to his colleagues is too far away for Job to continue 'And now I am become their song.' Accordingly it seems best to retain verse 1, excusing its disdain by Job's too natural irritation, and, with necessary alteration, let verse 9 immediately follow it.

2. According to the text, this verse explains why Job did not employ them; they were too weak to do his work. The offering of an explanation at all is rather surprising, equally so the hard, commercial temper that Job displays. Duhm reads 'Yea, the strength of their hands fails, vigour is perished in them.' In that case this verse belongs to the description of the pariahs.

ripe age: better as in marg. 'vigour.'

They gnaw the dry ground, in the gloom of wasteness
and desolation.
4 They pluck salt-wort by the bushes;
And the roots of the broom *are* their meat.
5 They are driven forth from the midst *of men*;
They cry after them as after a thief.
6 In the clefts of the valleys must they dwell,
In holes of the earth and of the rocks.
7 Among the bushes they bray;
Under the nettles they are gathered together.
8 *They are* children of fools, yea, children of base men;

3. They gnaw the dry ground, in, &c. Much more striking than the marg. 'They flee into the wilderness, into,' &c.

in the gloom of: the sense 'gloom' cannot be proved, the marg. gives two alternatives, '*which* yesternight *was*' and 'on the eve of,' the latter is not very intelligible, the former is possible, but the sense is not satisfactory. Some take it '*which* long ago *was*,' but the word cannot well mean this. Many scholars think the text must be corrupt. Duhm reads the word translated xii. 25 'They grope in.' Klostermann, improving on a suggestion of Hoffmann, 'their mother is wasteness and desolation.'

4. their meat: since the roots are very bitter, many prefer the marg. 'to warm them.' The roots are often used for fuel in the desert.

5. Thieves they were forced by want to be, as appears from xxiv. 6 (see note). Hence the hue and cry was started if one of them ventured near a civilized community.

6. The dwellings of these wretched troglodytes. We should probably translate as in the marg. 'In the most gloomy valleys,' since these deep, barren ravines, where the sunlight came but little, useless for tillage or pasture, would be the only haunts cheerfully abandoned to them. These martyrs of civilization, like the heroes of faith, 'wandered in deserts and mountains and caves, and the holes of the earth.'

7. They have already been compared to wild-asses xxiv. 5. The verse may refer to their gatherings, where their speech, loud and rough, reminds more cultured ears of the braying of an ass. The marg. translates 'stretch themselves.' We should perhaps render 'under the nettles they couple,' misbegetting as they were themselves misbegotten (verse 8); in this case 'bray' must be explained in the light of Jer. v. 8. **nettles:** marg. 'wild vetches.'

8. They are a feeble-witted folk, a horde of nameless ancestry,

They were scourged out of the land.
And now I am become their song, 9
Yea, I am a byword unto them.
They abhor me, they stand aloof from me, 10
And spare not to spit in my face.
For he hath loosed his cord, and afflicted me, 11

---

driven with blows from the cultivated land into the desert. The second line reads according to the marg. 'They are outcasts from the land.'

base men: Heb. '*men of* no name.'

9. This verse connects immediately with verse 1, only we should obviously not read 'But now,' which has become necessary after the insertion of verses 2–8. If any word should be read in place of 'now,' it might be the first person singular or third personal plural pronoun, 'And I, 'tis I have become their song,' or 'And 'tis their song that I have become.' It is not likely that the dull outcasts described in the preceding verses composed and sang these stinging lampoons about Job. It is the base rabble that formed the lowest stratum of the society in which Job lived, sharp-witted in pungent satire as our street-arabs, and as remorseless to their butts.

10. in my face: if they kept their distance, they could hardly spit in his face. We might translate 'before me,' i.e. they do not respect the conventional decencies in my presence. But was it considered unbecoming? Better, as in the marg., 'at the sight of me,' i.e. in sign of their loathing.

11. The text at this point begins to be in great disorder, and the sense is very doubtful. The root of the difficulty is largely to be found in the uncertainty whether Job is describing the conduct of those to whom he has just referred, or whether it is God's attack on him of which he is speaking. In this verse the singular and plural occur, 'he' in one line and 'they' in the next. The difficulty is further complicated by the uncertainty whether we should read **his cord,** or as in the marg. 'my cord,' and whether further we should not render 'bowstring' instead of 'cord.' The following verses also contain much that is obscure. On the whole, the present writer prefers to take the verses 11–15 as referring not to the attacks of the tormentors of verses 1, 9–10, but to God's assaults upon him by the hosts of misfortune He sends against him. The passage is very like xvi. 7–14, xix. 12, and this should probably control the interpretation here.

loosed his cord: the most obvious meaning of the words is that the unnamed subject has taken off the cord of his girdle to

And they have cast off the bridle before me.
12 Upon my right hand rise the rabble;
They thrust aside my feet,
And they cast up against me their ways of destruction.
13 They mar my path,
They set forward my calamity,
Even men that have no helper.
14 As through a wide breach they come:

---

chastise Job with it, but it is not easy to think that this could be said with reference to God, nor would the substitution of 'my cord' for **his cord** help matters. Rather we should have to read the first person, but render 'my bowstring'; then the complaint that God has relaxed his bowstring is the antithesis to xxix. 20, 'and my bow is renewed in my hand.' If the text of the second line is retained, the meaning should then be that in consequence of this action of God, which has made him like a bow unstrung, his tormentors cast off all restraint, though some think it is the hosts of misfortune that have thus cast off restraint. It is possible to refer the first line to the tormentors, the singular individualizing them one by one, but it would be better in that case to read 'they have loosed.'

12. The translation **rabble** fixes the reference to the tormentors. The marg. renders 'brood,' which admits a reference to the hosts of misfortune. Since the metaphor in the verse is that of a siege, the words 'upon my right hand' seem hardly suitable, as they would be if the figure were that of a law court, in which the accuser stood at the right hand. We should have expected it to be balanced by 'at the left hand.' It is simplest to read 'Against me,' and omit these words in the third line. The second line has no very intelligible meaning. The word translated 'thrust aside' is the same as that rendered 'they have cast off,' probably the line has arisen through dittography of 'they have cast off the bridle,' and should be struck out. The third line represents them as casting up a way by which they may more effectually carry the fortress by storm and destroy it (cf. xix. 12).

13. mar: marg. 'break up,' apparently paths of escape, though some think the way of life is meant.

set forward: they help on his ruin; the word is not elsewhere used like this.

The third line should probably be emended, and we should read with Dillmann and others, 'there is none to restrain them.'

14. The fortress is stormed, and the enemy pour in through a

In the midst of the ruin they roll themselves *upon me.*
Terrors are turned upon me, 15
They chase mine honour as the wind;
And my welfare is passed away as a cloud.
And now my soul is poured out within me; 16
Days of affliction have taken hold upon me.
In the night season my bones are pierced in me, 17
And the *pains* that gnaw me take no rest.
By the great force *of my disease* is my garment disfigured: 18

---

breach in the walls. This is better than the marg. 'As a wide breaking in *of waters.*'

15. They chase: marg. 'thou chasest,' but the word might be pointed as a passive, 'is chased.' Duhm by a slight change gets the sense 'is driven away,' and also corrects the word rendered 'mine honour' (marg. 'my nobility') to 'my happiness' to secure a parallel with the next line.

17. pierced in me: *lit.* 'pierced from upon me,' which seems to mean, pierced so that they fall from me. The marg. renders 'corroded *and drop* away from me.' The line is rather long, Budde strikes out 'in the night season,' Duhm 'in me.' It is possible that the reference to the night was introduced in blundering contrast to 'days of affliction' (verse 16).

the *pains* that gnaw me: *lit.* 'my gnawers,' the sense is correctly given by R.V., though some have thought of the worms in his sores (vii. 5) that were never still. The marg. renders 'my sinews take no rest.'

18. The verse as it stands in the text is very strangely expressed. The reference in **great force** is uncertain, whether of his disease or whether of God (so marg. 'By *his* great force'). Then what is the sense of the first line? Does it mean that under the afflicting hand of God, or the violence of his pain, Job twists his clothes out of shape? or that the discharge from his ulcers saturated his clothes, so that they stuck to him? or that the emaciation of his body made his clothes hang all out of shape on him? Some again take the **garment** as a metaphor for his skin. The poet is probably not responsible for the barely-intelligible text. Budde's emendation 'my flesh' for **my garment** does not suit the second line well, and leaves the ambiguity of 'great force' where it was. Since the line is probably intended to express the emaciation caused by his disease, Duhm's excellent emendation, 'By reason of great wasting my garment is crumpled together,' gives the needed sense with slight alteration (for *kōach yithḥappēs*

It bindeth me about as the collar of my coat.
19 He hath cast me into the mire,
And I am become like dust and ashes.
20 I cry unto thee, and thou dost not answer me:
I stand up, and thou lookest at me.
21 Thou art turned to be cruel to me:
With the might of thy hand thou persecutest me.
22 Thou liftest me up to the wind, thou causest me to ride
upon it;
And thou dissolvest me in the storm.

---

he reads *kaḥash yithhabbē'*. The *Shin* was transferred from the end of the first to the end of the second word). The second line means that his garment clings to him like a vest. The translation **collar of my coat** suggests close-fitting strongly to us, but the opening of the Oriental undergarment was large enough for the head to go through it. The phrase so rendered may simply mean 'like my vest.' It is not clear whether this line also refers to his emaciation. But the garment would surely hang loosely on his shrunken body, so that we should perhaps suppose that here the reference is to the abnormal swelling of other parts of the body which makes his garment fit tight to these.

18. The verse may describe the appearance of Job's skin, which is as if he had been rolled in the mire, or it may be a figurative expression for his deep humiliation.

19. This verse is important for its bearing on the questions raised by xxvii. 7–10. In the second line we should have expected 'thou lookest not at me,' and some read this. Still, Job may be thinking of God's malicious regard. The Syriac, followed by several, reads 'Thou standest,' and this gives a finer sense. While Job cries God will not listen, but stands looking at him with a cruel smile. Duhm by a slight change gets the sense 'thou ceasest to regard me' (*lit.* 'standest still from,' cf. Gen. xxix. 35).

21. Ley cuts out this verse as inconsistent with verse 20 and with the religious standpoint which Job has reached. Both reasons seem to the present writer incorrect.

22. God has given him to be the sport of the whirlwind, which has seized and borne him on high, till he is torn to pieces amid the howling of the storm. The Hebrew marg. reads for **storm** (*lit.* 'roar') the word translated in vi. 13 'effectual working.' If this is adopted we should probably follow the LXX and insert a single consonant and read 'without' before the noun, translating

For I know that thou wilt bring me to death, 23
And to the house appointed for all living.
Surely against a ruinous heap he will not put forth his 24
hand;
Though *it be* in his destruction, *one may utter* a cry because
of these things.
Did not I weep for him that was in trouble? 25
Was not my soul grieved for the needy?
When I looked for good, then evil came; 26
And when I waited for light, there came darkness.
My bowels boil, and rest not; 27
Days of affliction are come upon me.
I go mourning without the sun: 28

'without help.' The text, however, is finer, and must not be prosaically niggled at.

23. bring me: *lit.* 'bring me back.' Duhm accordingly points 'make me dwell'; but cf. 'naked shall I return thither,' i. 21. The second line is translated in the marg. 'And to the house of meeting for all living.'

24. The verse is translated in the marg. 'Howbeit doth not one stretch out the hand in his fall? or in his calamity therefore cry for help?' This is probably near the meaning, but the Hebrew is strange, though not, as Siegfried thinks, 'entirely void of sense.' It would be much better, adopting a suggestion of Dillmann, to read 'Howbeit doth not a sinking man stretch out the hand?' (*tōbē'a* for *bē'ā*.) The second line reads with a slight correction 'or doth he not in his calamity cry for help.' Job means that while his fate is settled (verse 23), it is still natural that he should cry for help, just as a drowning man might do, though in his heart of hearts he knew it to be vain. The translation in the text is a pitiful plea that God should not smite one so stricken already; the second line excuses the cry he utters, but is not very clear. Ley thinks it is a complaint that God does not destroy him outright, but keeps him lingering in pain.

25. I wept for the sorrow of others, why should I not then for my own? Duhm thinks the verse continues the thought of verse 24 and substitutes the third person, 'Or does he not weep who is in trouble, Is not the soul of the needy grieved?'

26. I may well complain when all my hopes are blighted.

27. The unresting turmoil of inward emotions.

28. The marg. 'I go blackened, but not by the sun' is perhaps

I stand up in the assembly, and cry for help.
29 I am a brother to jackals,
And a companion to ostriches.
30 My skin is black, *and falleth* from me,
And my bones are burned with heat.
31 Therefore is my harp *turned* to mourning,
And my pipe into the voice of them that weep.

31 I made a covenant with mine eyes;

---

a better translation of the present text (cf. Song of Songs i. 6 and Byron's 'My hair is grey, Though not with years'). The crust which forms in ecthyma is black (see note on ii. 7). But the translation 'go mourning' is to be preferred, and the words 'without the sun' corrected. Duhm, followed by Ley, by the insertion of a single consonant gets the excellent sense 'I go mourning without comfort' (*nᵉḥāmāh* for *ḥammah*). The second line is strange, what 'assembly' is meant? Duhm emends brilliantly 'I stand up in the assembly of jackals' (*shū'āl*). This suits the next verse. The word translated by him 'jackals' is that so translated in the marg. of Judges xv. 4, where 'foxes' stands in the text, in the story of Samson firing the Philistines' corn. The reference is to the wailing cry uttered by these animals.

29. jackals: a different word from that read by Duhm in verse 28. He translates here 'wolves'; the meaning is not precisely known. For the 'ostrich' cf. xxxix. 13, and for the cry of both Mic. i. 8.

30. Symptoms of his disease.

xxxi. 1–4. Job had pledged himself against evil desires of the eyes, for the all-seeing God rewarded evil doers with disaster.

xxxi. 5–8. If he had been guilty of falsehood (a fair trial would prove his integrity), if he has yielded to covetousness, let others enjoy the fruit of his labours.

xxxi. 9–12. If he has been guilty of adultery, let his wife be the slave and concubine of another, for the crime is heinous and leads to ruin.

xxxi. 13–23. If he had trampled on justice, when his slaves had a complaint against him, how could he answer God, who made them as well as him? If he has dealt unkindly with the poor, the widow and the orphan (though God had nurtured him from his birth), if he has not clothed the starving, if he has oppressed the orphan, relying on his influence with the judges, let his arm be

How then should I look upon a maid?
For what *is* the portion of God from above, 2
And the heritage of the Almighty from on high?

---

broken. For he had been terror-smitten at the thought of God's vengeance.

xxxi. 24–34. If he trusted in wealth; if he secretly yielded to idolatry, this would be a sin to be punished by the judges. If he rejoiced at the downfall of his foe (nay, he had not suffered himself to seek his destruction by a curse), if he had not been hospitable, if he had committed any sins he needed to hide.

xxxi. 35–37. Oh that one would hear him! Let God answer him, let him have His accusation, proudly would he enter His presence with it, and declare to Him all his ways.

xxxi. 38–40. If his land cry out against him, because he has robbed its fruits or gained it by killing the owner, let it bring forth thorns and weeds instead of corn.

xxxi. **1.** The chapter begins abruptly, but it would be no improvement to follow the LXX, with some scholars, and strike out verses 1–4. For verse 5 would form a much more abrupt beginning, and against the view that verses 1–4 have been substituted for the original introduction we may set the impression of originality that they make. It is, however, most surprising that Job should begin with a very special type of sin, and further should give as his reason for avoiding it so general a principle as that in verse 3. We should rather expect a very general term for sin to stand at the beginning. The present writer would therefore suggest that the second line ran originally 'How then should I look upon folly'? (*n*^{e}*bālāh* for *b*^{e}*thūlāh*). We might compare 'Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity.' If the text be retained we may compare Matt. v. 28. With Job's large number of slaves the temptation, as history proves, was terribly real. Not only does he refrain from actual seduction, he will not even suffer himself to give way to longing. The inwardness of this morality is quite in keeping with the rest of the chapter, but for the reason already given it is questionable whether the text is right.

2. It seems at first strange that Job should in the midst of his own calamities give as the reason for refraining from sin that disaster is sent by God on the evil-doer. But it would be very hazardous to infer from this that verses 2–4 must be a later insertion, for Job is speaking from the standpoint he occupied before his troubles. These were the thoughts that then weighed with him. The marg. reads 'For what portion *should I have* of God . . . and what heritage, &c.? Is there not calamity, &c.?'

3 Is it not calamity to the unrighteous,
And disaster to the workers of iniquity?
4 Doth not he see my ways,
And number all my steps?
5 If I have walked with vanity,
And my foot hath hasted to deceit;
6 (Let me be weighed in an even balance,
That God may know mine integrity;)
7 If my step hath turned out of the way,
And mine heart walked after mine eyes,
And if any spot hath cleaved to mine hands:
8 Then let me sow, and let another eat;
Yea, let the produce of my field be rooted out.
9 If mine heart have been enticed unto a woman,
And I have laid wait at my neighbour's door:
10 Then let my wife grind unto another,
And let others bow down upon her.
11 For that were an heinous crime;
Yea, it were an iniquity to be punished by the judges:
12 For it is a fire that consumeth unto Destruction,

---

3. Ley places this between verses 13 and 15.

5. vanity: i.e. falsehood.

6. If he is weighed in a true balance he will not be found wanting (cf. Dan. v. 27).

7. The stepping from the path of life intended seems from the second line to have been coveting what was not his own.

8. the produce of my field: this gives correctly the sense of the Heb. 'my produce.' The marg. gives 'my offspring,' but obviously this is not the meaning.

10. grind: the slave-woman who ground at the mill held the lowest position of all; cf. Exod. xi. 5, 'from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maid-servant that is behind the mill.' The second line imprecates retribution in kind, but we need not, as many have done, impose that sense on the first. A good parallel is Isa. xlvii. 2; we might also compare the vengeance on Samson, Judges xvi. 21.

12. Destruction: Heb. 'Abaddon,' see xxvi. 6. **For root out,**

And would root out all mine increase.
If I did despise the cause of my manservant or of my 13
maidservant,
When they contended with me:
What then shall I do when God riseth up? 14
And when he visiteth, what shall I answer him?
Did not he that made me in the womb make him? 15
And did not one fashion us in the womb?
If I have withheld the poor from *their* desire, 16
Or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail;
Or have eaten my morsel alone, 17
And the fatherless hath not eaten thereof;
(Nay, from my youth he grew up with me as with a father, 18
And I have been her guide from my mother's womb;)
If I have seen any perish for want of clothing, 19
Or that the needy had no covering;
If his loins have not blessed me, 20

---

which does not well suit the metaphor of fire, Duhm reads 'burn up' (*tisrōph* for *t*e*shārēsh*).

13–15. He had not, with the contemptuous cynicism of might, thrust aside the cause of his slaves, when they had a case to urge against him. How could he have stood before God's bar and defended such conduct? For God was the maker of both, the right of the slave was as much to Him as Job's right, a most remarkable advance on the ethics of antiquity, even in Israel. Possibly verse 14 should, as Duhm suggests, be placed before verse 18, which at present follows abruptly after verse 17.

16. marg. 'If I have withheld aught that the poor desired.'

to fail with unfulfilled longing, when I might have helped her.

18. The first line is surprising, though Job may quite early in life have taken up the position of patron of the helpless and needy. The second line, however, is too strong an exaggeration. An infant guiding the widow can hardly be the picture intended. We should much more probably read, with several scholars, 'For from my youth like a father He caused me to grow up, And was my guide from my mother's womb;' i. e. God had cared for him from infancy to manhood, he in return must care for the weak, cf. Ps. xxii. 9, 10.

And if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep ;
21 If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless,
Because I saw my help in the gate :
22 Then let my shoulder fall from the shoulder blade,
And mine arm be broken from the bone.
23 For calamity from God was a terror to me,
And by reason of his excellency I could do nothing.
24 If I have made gold my hope,
And have said to the fine gold, *Thou art* my confidence ;
25 If I rejoiced because my wealth was great,
And because mine hand had gotten much ;
26 If I beheld the sun when it shined,
Or the moon walking in brightness ;
27 And my heart hath been secretly enticed,

---

21. Job had not oppressed the fatherless, though he knew that he could win his case if he were tried for violence in the courts. Possibly we should read 'against the blameless' (so Duhm), since it is rather strange to find the orphan mentioned again.

22. The punishment of the offending member ; cf. Cranmer at the stake, and the descriptions of penalties in the next world, which have frequently been constructed on this principle.

23. Perhaps out of place after the imprecation, but it is not very suitable after verse 14 (Bickell), or verse 28 (Duhm).

26. As one of the 'sons of the East,' Job had a powerful temptation to worship the heavenly bodies, which from the time of Manasseh had also been a serious peril to the Jews. **the sun** is literally 'the light,' but probably the sun is meant, though the term might have a wider application. The moon moving in stately splendour across the wonderful Eastern sky is so majestic a spectacle that the thrill of homage it inspired is not hard to understand. But Job's heart was so right with God that even this fascination did not cast on him its deadly spell.

27. The old chords were in his nature to respond to the touch of the old faith. Outwardly a monotheist, he yet knew the seductiveness of this worship. (Cf. Grant Allen's story *The Reverend John Creedy*, also *The Beckoning Hand.*) But he sternly held it at bay, and would not, while upholding his rigid monotheism before the world, indulge the unholy hankering with a furtive act of compliance.

And my mouth hath kissed my hand:
This also were an iniquity to be punished by the judges: 28
For I should have lied to God that is above.
If I rejoiced at the destruction of him that hated me, 29
Or lifted up myself when evil found him;
(Yea, I suffered not my mouth to sin 30
By asking his life with a curse;)
If the men of my tent said not, 31
Who can find one that hath not been satisfied with his flesh?
The stranger did not lodge in the street; 32
But I opened my doors to the traveller;

The second line is literally 'and my hand hath kissed my mouth.' This strange form is chosen because the hand is the main instrument in the act, first it touches the lips to receive the kiss, then wafts the kiss to the object of worship. The kiss of homage was given to images by the worshipper, and, of course, 'thrown' to such deities as the distant heavenly bodies.

28. Idolatry was made by Deuteronomy a crime to be punished by death (Deut. xvii. 2-7). For **lied to God** the marg. gives 'denied God.'

29. One of the most beautiful traits in the whole picture, standing out against the unlovely background of not a little in the O. T.

30. The curse was supposed to have an inherent magical force which brought about its fulfilment. **Mouth** is properly 'palate,' the organ of taste; the suggestion is that the cursing of a foe is a dainty delicious morsel, but Job would not gratify his palate with it.

31. Job's hospitality was acknowledged by his retainers to be extended to every one. But the more obvious rendering is, Would that one were not satisfied with his flesh! which seems to mean, would that we might still gratify his hospitality by finding some one who had not yet partaken of his bounty! The wish-formula is literally 'who will give.' Duhm strikes out the words 'will give' and gets the sense 'Who is not satisfied with his flesh!' The marg. renders as A. V. 'Oh, that we had of his flesh! we cannot be satisfied,' but this yields no suitable sense.

32. the traveller: Heb. 'the way.' But with a different pointing the sense is 'traveller.'

33 If like Adam I covered my transgressions,
By hiding mine iniquity in my bosom ;
34 Because I feared the great multitude,
And the contempt of families terrified me,
So that I kept silence, and went not out of the door—
35 Oh that I had one to hear me !
(Lo, here is my signature, let the Almighty answer me ;)
And *that I had* the indictment which mine adversary hath written !

---

33. like Adam: better as marg. 'after the manner of men.' The reference to Adam is not specially appropriate to concealment of sin from men, and explicit references to the sacred history are avoided in the book. A slight change would give 'among men.' The verses mean that his life had been so upright that he had nothing of which to be ashamed or that might give him just cause to dread the fury of the populace. Hence he did not need to keep close at home, but could fearlessly mingle among men and look all his fellows in the face.

35. Profoundly stirred by the solemn assertion that he had always kept a conscience void of offence, his soul lifts itself to this splendid impassioned utterance, which worthily closes the human debate. He cries that God should answer him and give him the book in which the charges against him were written. Proudly he would lift it on his shoulder, nay, place it as a crown on his head, and thus crowned as a prince he would meet God face to face, and in conscious innocence lay bare before Him all the acts of his life.

Oh that I had one to hear me: generally it is thought that God is intended, and this harmonizes with Job's wish elsewhere and the challenge in the next line. Yet it is quite possible that it is for a sympathetic human ear that he is longing, to which he may entrust the declaration he is about to make.

signature: Heb. 'mark,' the sign which he appended to his assertion of innocence, not to his indictment of God, to which no reference is made in this passage. To this formally attested document he summons the Almighty to reply.

Since the third line is without a parallel, it is possible that a line has fallen out before it, Duhm suggests 'Oh that I had the roll.' It is usually thought that Job expresses the wish that he had the indictment (Heb. 'book') drawn up against him by his Divine adversary. The term used for 'adversary' is literally 'man of my strife,' and if the reference be to God, we must

Surely I would carry it upon my shoulder ; 36
I would bind it unto me as a crown.
I would declare unto him the number of my steps ; 37
As a prince would I go near unto him.
If my land cry out against me, 38
And the furrows thereof weep together ;

---

suppose that the phrase has come to mean simply 'opponent,' the idea expressed in 'man' having fallen out of consciousness (just as we may speak of a woman as a Bachelor of Arts). Ley thinks only a man can be intended, and that the text would mean 'my advocate,' but deletes the word 'my strife' as a gloss on 'book.' Hoonacker, who supposes an inversion in the order of the lines (see for his view of the passage *Révue Biblique*, April, 1903), thinks that we cannot suppose Job to have braved God, by defiantly entering His presence, with His indictment worn as a mark of distinction. Accordingly he argues that it is a human adversary, whose indictment of him Job desires, and into whose presence he would proudly enter bearing it. But while it would be too much to say that this is impossible, it is nevertheless improbable that Job should in the very climax of his defence think of any human opponent, whose accusation he would wear as a trophy and to whom he would vindicate his ways. If elsewhere he has insisted that it is with God, not with man, that he is concerned, here in the supreme moment, when he gathers himself together for his last great utterance, it is God alone whom he would confront. Defiant the tone may be, but why should the poet have shrunk from letting his hero brave God, in proud assurance of his integrity? It is no emasculated pietist whom he has chosen for his protagonist in this titanic struggle.

36. Some explain that Job would thus proudly wear it, because it could contain nothing against him. But is it not far finer and more impressive if he means an indictment corresponding to his suffering, that God should say of him in word what He had said of him in act? He would bind God's accusations to him, transfiguring the shame into glory by the radiant glow of conscious innocence. Never had his independence of all approval save that of his own conscience reached a height more sublime.

37. go near unto him: marg. 'present it *to him*,' but the text is to be preferred.

38. It is disastrous that after the splendid close in verses 35–37 a dislocation of verses should have brought verses 38–40 into their present position, where they ruin the effect. With very few exceptions, scholars are agreed that originally they stood in a different part of the chapter, and probably through

39 If I have eaten the fruits thereof without money,
Or have caused the owners thereof to lose their life:
40 Let thistles grow instead of wheat,
And cockle instead of barley.

The words of Job are ended.

32 [B] So these three men ceased to answer Job, because

---

accidental omission by a copyist from their original place, were put at the end of the chapter. Very different views have been held as to the position which they held, and they have been inserted after verses 8, 12, 15, 23, 25, 32 and 34. The point is not worth discussing. The 'cry of the land' is most naturally referred to the cry of the blood of the former owners, shed by Job (verse 39), as the blood of Naboth might be supposed to cry for vengeance on Ahab, who had despoiled him of his vineyard by murder. The imprecation in verse 40 seems rather slight for the offence, but the story of Cain supplies a rather striking parallel. Not only does his brother's blood cry from the ground, but he is in consequence 'cursed from the ground,' and therefore, when he tills the ground, it will not yield its strength to him, which (comparing Gen. iii. 17, 18) seems to mean much the same as verse 40. Duhm strikes out verse 39 as an incorrect explanation, and supposes the cry of the ground to be prompted by some wrong done to it, e. g. neglect of proper rest, or sowing with two kinds of seed (Lev. xix. 19). The grounds for eliminating verse 39 seem, however, to be inadequate.

39. fruits: Heb. 'strength.'

40. For **thistles** the marg. gives 'thorns,' and 'noisome weeds' for **cockle.**

The words of Job are ended: a later addition. Budde, however, follows the LXX in connecting the clause closely with xxxii. 1. 'The words of Job were ended, and these three men,' &c.

Ley thinks the contents of the chapter have been seriously disarranged. His reconstruction is very ingenious, but involves more transposition than can well be justified. It may be seen in his *Das Buch Hiob*, pp. 89–92.

xxxii. At this point we have six chapters inserted, containing a contribution to the debate by Elihu, a juvenile speaker, whose presence comes on the reader as a complete surprise, since he has not before been mentioned, and the supposed references in the previous speeches to an audience listening to the discussion are

he was righteous in his own eyes. Then was kindled the 2

---

purely imaginary. He is introduced in a prolix manner, quite unlike that found in the prose narrative. If the speeches of Elihu were regarded as genuine, it would be a probable suggestion that verses 2–5 should be regarded as a later insertion, since it would be hard to think of the author composing anything so intolerably diffuse. Four times we are informed that Elihu's wrath was kindled. But when it is recognized that the speeches are a later addition, there is no temptation to strike out verses 2–5, which there is no difficulty in assigning to the author of these speeches. Besides, some explanation of Elihu's presence is due to the reader. The poetical accentuation has been continued in verses 1–6, though they are in prose.

xxxii. 1–5. The friends ceased to argue, for Job was immovably self-righteous. Elihu was angry with Job for making himself out to be more righteous than God, and with the friends for their failure to refute Job. He had not previously intervened, because the three friends were older, but when they could not continue the debate he was angry.

xxxii. 6–14. Elihu explains his silence by his youth, for he thought age should be wise. But this is not so, for wisdom comes by Divine inspiration, so they should hearken to him. He had listened to them, but none convinced Job. Let them not despair because Job is too wise for them, and God alone can vanquish him. For Job has still to debate with him, and he will not use their pointless weapons.

xxxii. 15–22. The friends are dumb, must he therefore be silent? No, he is full of words, and like bottles which must have vent or burst under the force of the fermenting wine, he must speak to find relief from the intolerable pressure. He will speak without respect of persons; fear of the Almighty will secure him from flattery.

1. The friends continued the debate no longer, because they felt it to be useless since Job was immovably entrenched in his self-complacency. The poet himself could hardly have written this, for as plainly as possible the last three chapters were intended by him to bring the human debate to an end and let God answer Job. The LXX and Syriac, followed by Geiger, read 'because he was righteous in their eyes,' i. e. Job had convinced them of his righteousness. This is clearly incorrect, especially if xxvii. 7–23 formed part of Zophar's last speech.

2. The poet does not even tell us the name of Job's father, much less those of the friends, the supplementer tells us the name of his hero's father, and his family. The names of Elihu (he is

wrath of Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram: against Job was his wrath kindled, be-
3 cause he justified himself rather than God. Also against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had
4 found no answer, and yet had condemned Job. Now Elihu had waited to speak unto Job, because they were
5 elder than he. And when Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of these three men, his wrath was kindled.

6 And Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite answered and said,

I am young, and ye are very old;

---

my God) and his father (God blesses) are clearly not traditional names like the rest; and Ram, which means 'the exalted,' may similarly have been invented; it occurs nowhere else except Ruth iv. 19, 1 Chron. ii. 9, 10 as son of Hezron and brother of Jerahmeel, and in verse 25 as a son of Jerahmeel, and cannot be safely regarded as an abbreviation of Aram (Syria). Buz was a Nahorite clan, represented in Gen. xxii. 21 as a brother of Uz, therefore Elihu and Job were of closely related stocks. But in Jer. xxv. 23 it occurs in connexion with the Arabian tribes Dedan and Tema. It is, however, a very curious fact, pointed out by Hoffmann, that in xxxi. 34 we have in the words 'the contempt of families' almost the precise words here translated **the Buzite, of the family of Ram** (Buz means 'contempt').

rather than God: some translate 'before God,' but the meaning is probably that Job by the assertions of his own innocence and attacks on God's character and government made himself out to be more righteous than God. We are at a different stage from that in iv. 17, in the interval Job's criticism of God has come.

3. The text seems rather to mean that they had found no answer with which to condemn Job, such answers as they had made being inadequate to their purpose. The Jewish tradition is that the original text was 'condemned God.' The meaning would then be that by their failure to reply effectively to Job's assaults on God they virtually condemned Him. However little they desired this, it was the result that emerged from the debate.

4. *lit.* 'waited for Job with words.'

6. Cf. xii. 12. Elihu is little troubled by his modesty in the sequel, he more than makes up for his bashful silence.

Wherefore I held back, and durst not shew you mine opinion.
I said, Days should speak, 7
And multitude of years should teach wisdom.
But there is a spirit in man, 8
And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding.
It is not the great that are wise, 9
Nor the aged that understand judgement.
Therefore I said, Hearken to me; 10
I also will shew mine opinion.
Behold, I waited for your words, 11
I listened for your reasons,
Whilst ye searched out what to say.
Yea, I attended unto you, 12
And, behold, there was none that convinced Job,
Or that answered his words, among you.

---

8. If the reference is to the common possession of the spirit by man, the thought seems to be that the breath of God by which men live is the source also of their understanding. But while this is apparently the meaning of the text, it is hardly that required by the argument. This is rather that Elihu, though young, is wise because he speaks by a Divine inspiration, in which the friends, though old, have no share. A slight change is made by Duhm, who thus gets the sense 'But the spirit enlighteneth man,' cf. for the two parallel verbs Ps. cxix. 130. This is better than Bickell's suggestion that we should read 'spirit of God' for 'spirit,' since this again suggests something common to men generally.

9. Budde places verses 13, 14 between verses 9 and 10, and strikes out 11, 12, 15–17. Hatch omitted 11–17. Duhm omits 10, and places 15–17 between 9 and 11. It is to be noticed that 10^b is identical with 17^b, and that 10^a and 17^a are also much alike in sense.

10. said: marg. 'say.'

11, 12. Elihu had closely watched the development of the debate, and had to confess how unconvincing were the arguments of the friends. Possibly the meaning is that he had waited for arguments that never came.

13 Beware lest ye say, We have found wisdom;
God may vanquish him, not man:
14 For he hath not directed his words against me;
Neither will I answer him with your speeches.
15 They are amazed, they answer no more:
They have not a word to say.
16 And shall I wait, because they speak not,
Because they stand still, and answer no more?
17 I also will answer my part,
I also will shew mine opinion.
18 For I am full of words;
The spirit within me constraineth me.
19 Behold, my belly is as wine which hath no vent;
Like new bottles it is ready to burst.

---

13. The friends may excuse their inability to vanquish Job by the wisdom they have discovered in him; too clever for men to refute, all that can be done is to leave him to God. No need to call in God, is Elihu's retort, I am quite equal to the task of overcoming him. The verse is a direct polemic against the poet, a strong assertion that the Divine speeches which follow had been better omitted. Fortunately the author could not suppress them. The marg. renders with A. V. 'Lest ye should say, We have found out wisdom; God thrusteth him down, not man: now he,' &c. But this yields no very satisfactory sense.

14. You need not give up the conflict as lost, for he has still to debate with me, and I shall not use the arguments that have proved such useless weapons in your hands. His promise is ill-kept.

15. Spoken of the friends in the third person, the soliloquy being more contemptuous than direct address, cf. Isa. xxii. 16, and just on that ground all the less to be struck out.

16. That they can say nothing is no reason why I should be silent.

18-20. Elihu's conceit would be less insufferable to an Oriental than to us; but it goes far beyond anything in the other speeches. He has all the time been bottling up his words; he is like new wine-skins, in which the wine is fermenting and which must get vent or burst.

within me: *lit.* 'of my belly.'
it is ready: marg. 'which are ready.'

I will speak, that I may be refreshed ; 20
I will open my lips and answer.
Let me not, I pray you, respect any man's person ; 21
Neither will I give flattering titles unto any man.
For I know not to give flattering titles ; 22
Else would my Maker soon take me away.
Howbeit, Job, I pray thee, hear my speech, **33**
And hearken to all my words.
Behold now, I have opened my mouth, 2
My tongue hath spoken in my mouth.

---

be refreshed: marg. 'find relief.'

21. The parade of impartiality is quite sincerely meant.

xxxiii. 1–7. Elihu invites Job to hear his sincere words and answer if he can. He is like Job a creature of God's hands, and therefore cannot overwhelm him with the terror of Divine majesty.

xxxiii. 8–13. Job has affirmed his innocence and accused God of hostility, but unjustly. Why does he complain that God will not answer him?

xxxiii. 14–18. For God answers man in two ways. First, by dreams and night visions, to withhold man from courses that lead to destruction.

xxxiii. 19–30. Another of God's ways is when sore illness brings a man near to death, and the destroying angels are ready to take away his life. If one of the thousand angels, set apart for the purpose, instructs him, and graciously intercedes for him and provides a ransom, then he is restored to perfect health. He renews his communion with God, and proclaims before men his own sin and God's grace. Such are God's ways of saving man from destruction.

xxxiii. 31–33. Let Job listen in silence to Elihu's further utterances, though if he has anything to urge in self-defence Elihu will willingly listen to him. Otherwise let him be silent and learn wisdom from Elihu.

1. Elihu, unlike the other speakers, frequently addresses Job by name. This is not adequately explained as due to the necessity of distinguishing between Job and the friends, for this the singular and plural forms of address would have sufficed. It is one of the supplementer's mannerisms.

2. It would show a strange lack of literary tact to credit the

3 My words *shall utter* the uprightness of my heart:
And that which my lips know they shall speak sincerely.
4 The spirit of God hath made me,
And the breath of the Almighty giveth me life.
5 If thou canst, answer thou me;
Set *thy words* in order before me, stand forth.
6 Behold, I am toward God even as thou art:
I also am formed out of the clay.
7 Behold, my terror shall not make thee afraid,

---

great genius to whom we owe the poem with such bathos as this, but Bickell needlessly strikes it out as 'too prosaic even for Elihu.' **mouth** is literally 'palate.'

3. Literally 'uprightness of heart *are* my words,' a rather awkward sentence. Duhm makes a slight correction (*yāshīg* for *yōsher*); and gets the sense 'My heart overflows with words of knowledge, My lips speak sincerely'; there is in that case a reminiscence of the metaphor in xxxii. 19.

4. Cf. xxxii. 8. This stands in no good connexion here, but it probably followed verse 6 originally (see note), and meant I am, like you, a creature of God. Budde and Duhm unite to omit it, but transposition is all that is required. The reference is not to any special endowment of the speaker, but to his participation with Job in the common origin of man (Gen. ii. 7).

5 should follow immediately on verse 3. The second line might also mean 'Set the battle in array before me.'

6. The marg. 'I am according to thy wish in God's stead' (so A.V.) is clearly incorrect. Job wished God to speak, not another human special pleader, and even if we could torture the words into saying that Elihu, as God's deputy, was speaking to gratify as far as possible Job's wish for God to appear, this would not suit the next line. He means that he and Job both stand on the same footing before God. He, like Job, was formed out of the clay. The reference is to Gen. ii. 7, and the fact that there the formation of man from the dust of the ground is followed by the breathing into his nostrils the breath of life is almost enough to prove that verse 4, corresponding to this second part of the creative act, originally stood after verse 6, and is accordingly not, as Budde says, superfluous here.

7. The reference is to Job's fear that if God appeared he might be paralysed by the dread inspired by His majesty (ix. 34, xiii. 21). You need not be afraid of *me*, Elihu says, I am just a man like yourself. The implied suggestion is that he can explain

Neither shall my pressure be heavy upon thee.
Surely thou hast spoken in mine hearing, 8
And I have heard the voice of *thy* words, *saying*,
I am clean, without transgression; 9
I am innocent, neither is there iniquity in me:
Behold, he findeth occasions against me, 10
He counteth me for his enemy;
He putteth my feet in the stocks, 11
He marketh all my paths.
Behold, I will answer thee, in this thou art not just; 12
For God is greater than man.

---

what Job wants to know, without God appearing for this purpose, and without the risks to Job such an appearance would involve; once more (see note on xxxii. 13) a criticism of the poet for letting God speak to Job out of the storm. How comforted Job should feel to get what he wants on such easy terms! One can imagine how the poet's scorn would have crushed this presumptuous meddler.

my pressure: the word occurs only here; it is better with many scholars to read with the LXX, 'my hand.'

8. After this diffuse, inflated, conceited introduction, in which Elihu occupies twenty-four verses, telling his betters that he is going to speak and explaining why he does so, he comes to the matter in hand. He proceeds to select for rebuke Job's self-justification and his accusation of God.

9. Job's assertions perhaps hardly went so far as this, in fact he admits transgression in vii. 21, xiii. 26. Still, he had affirmed his integrity in very strong terms ix. 21, x. 7, xiii. 18, xvi. 17, xxiii. 7, 10–12, xxvii. 4–6, xxxi.

10. Cf. x. 13–17, xix. 6–12. The first line summarizes Job's words, the second quotes xiii. 24. **occasions:** marg. 'causes of alienation.'

11. Quoted from xiii. 27.

12. The marg. renders the first line 'Behold, in this thou art not just; I will answer thee.' It is characteristic of the friends, and still more of Elihu, to rebut Job's assertions of God's immorality with affirmations of His greatness. The LXX translates a different text, 'Behold thou sayest I am righteous, and He does not answer.' The word to be righteous is much like the word to cry, and on the basis of this emendation by Bickell, Duhm reads, 'Behold, if I cry He does not answer.' In this case

13 Why dost thou strive against him?
For he giveth not account of any of his matters.
14 For God speaketh once,
Yea twice, *though man* regardeth it not.
15 In a dream, in a vision of the night,
When deep sleep falleth upon men,
In slumberings upon the bed;

Elihu is still quoting Job, and the reference is to such passages as ix. 16, xiii. 24, xix. 7, xxiii. 8, 9, xxx. 20. In the second line the LXX translation also presupposes a different Hebrew text; Duhm reads 'Eloah hides himself from men' (cf. ix. 11, xxiii. 3, 8, 9).

13. The marg. renders 'Why dost thou strive against him, for that he giveth not account of his matters?' In that case the meaning is, Why do you complain that God gives no account of His dealings with you? This is much better than the text, inasmuch as verse 14 then continues, You are mistaken in your facts, God *does* speak to men. The text means, Why are you so foolish as to enter on a useless struggle with God? He will never condescend to explain His actions to you. This would fit Elihu's reprobation of the hope that God would Himself answer Job. But it does not suit the passage which follows, since Elihu asserts that there are ways in which God does speak to men. The translation of the second line is however indefensible. The literal translation is 'For (or that) He does not answer any of his words.' We must either take 'his words' to mean man's words, or, altering the pronominal suffix, read 'That He does not answer any of thy words,' or, with the LXX, 'He does not answer any of my words.' The meaning is in any case, Why strive with God on the ground that He does not answer you? (verse 13). He does answer in two ways (verse 14).

14. Rather as marg., 'in one way, yea, in two.'

though man **regardeth it not:** *lit.* 'he doth not see it.' The meaning may be that God's modes of revelation are invisible. The text is very elliptical. The sense required seems to be that God speaks in one way, and then if man does not pay any regard, He speaks in a second way. Several have unjustifiably got this meaning out of the present text. It is better with Ley to insert 'if,' rendering 'yea, in two, if man regardeth it not.'

15. The first way, a dream in the night. The description recalls that of Eliphaz iv. 12 ff.; the second line is quoted from iv. 13, and therefore needlessly struck out by Bickell, Budde, and Duhm.

Then he openeth the ears of men, 16
And sealeth their instruction,
That he may withdraw man *from his* purpose, 17
And hide pride from man ;
He keepeth back his soul from the pit, 18
And his life from perishing by the sword.
He is chastened also with pain upon his bed, 19
And with continual strife in his bones :

---

16. openeth : *lit.* 'uncovereth,' cf. 1 Sam. ix. 15, 2 Sam. vii. 27, also Isa. l. 5.

sealeth their instruction : the meaning is not clear. It may be He communicates the instruction, then closes the ear and seals it, that it may be retained ; or, He impresses the instruction on the recipients as an impression is stamped on a seal. Since, however, Elihu contemplates that God's action may fail of its purpose, a metaphor implying a permanent impression seems inappropriate. The LXX pointed the word translated 'sealeth' differently, and we should probably with several scholars accept this, translating 'and terrifieth them through warnings.'

17. The text is to be preferred to the marg. 'That man may put away *his* purpose, and that he may hide.' It would be better, with many, to insert 'from his' in the Hebrew, though it would perhaps be still better to read with the LXX, 'That he may withdraw man from unrighteousness.'

hide : an unsuitable word. Several emendations have been proposed. Either Dillmann's 'destroy' (*y^e^kalleh*) or Bickell's 'cut off' (*y^e^kasseaḥ*) would do admirably. It would be a mistake to build on this passage and xxxvi. 9 the theory that the secret sin in Job brought to light by Elihu is spiritual pride.

18. Better as in marg. 'That he may keep back.'

perishing by the sword (marg. 'weapons'). The Hebrew is very strange ; Duhm proposes a much more probable reading, 'going down to Sheol.' Marshall cleverly suggests 'into the flame,' i. e. of Gehenna ; but does not this imply too developed an eschatology ?

19. God's second method of revelation, apparently employed when the first has passed unregarded (see note on verse 14). This method is that of the ministry of angels in sickness.

The alternative reading 'While all his bones are firm,' though accepted by Dillmann, gives no suitable sense. The meaning is that his bones are wrenched by his pains as if two parties were at strife over them, each seeking to tear them from the other.

20 So that his life abhorreth bread,
And his soul dainty meat.
21 His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen;
And his bones that were not seen stick out.
22 Yea, his soul draweth near unto the pit,
And his life to the destroyers.
23 If there be with him an angel,
An interpreter, one among a thousand,
To shew unto man what is right for him;
24 Then he is gracious unto him, and saith,

---

20. Cf. Ps. cvii. 18. **life** is a synonym for 'soul,' which here perhaps means appetite. He is hungry, but his sickness gives him nausea at the sight of food.

21. The first line may mean, His flesh is so destroyed as to lose its comeliness (cf. 1 Sam. xvi. 12). The translation in the text gives a strange sense, for the flesh does not become invisible, even in the severest illnesses. Duhm reads 'his flesh is consumed by wasting' (*rāzē*, Isa. xxiv. 16, for *rāʾî*).

that were not seen: very prosaic; we might translate 'And his bones are gradually laid bare.' But perhaps the words should be omitted as a variant of the similar word in the preceding line.

22. the destroyers: i. e. the angels of death. They are mentioned nowhere else in the O. T., though we have similar references in the story of the angel of the pestilence, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17, which is parallel to 1 Chron. xxi. 15, 16, also 2 Kings xix. 35 = Isa. xxxvii. 36, parallel to 2 Chron. xxxii. 21 (Sennacherib's army), further Ps. lxxviii. 49. We might also compare in the N. T. 'perished by the destroyer,' 1 Cor. x. 10 (the murmuring Israelites in the desert). These examples, however, afford no very close parallel. Accordingly several read 'to the dead.' But it is mistaken to correct the text just because no parallel can be quoted. Where have we a parallel to the next verse?

23. When the sufferer is thus about to fall into the clutches of the angels of death, another angel, whose function it is to explain to him God's purpose in his suffering, is sent to deliver him. This angel is 'one of the thousand' (marg.) told off for this special service, so bountiful is the provision God has made. He shows to man what is right for him (marg. 'his uprightness). Possibly the text originally was 'his fault' (cf. LXX).

24. It has been usual to suppose that God is the speaker, but the change of subject is unlikely. We should translate with

Deliver him from going down to the pit,
I have found a ransom.
His flesh shall be fresher than a child's ; 25
He returneth to the days of his youth :
He prayeth unto God, and he is favourable unto him ; 26
So that he seeth his face with joy :
And he restoreth unto man his righteousness.
He singeth before men, and saith, 27
I have sinned, and perverted that which was right,
And it profited me not :
He hath redeemed my soul from going into the pit, 28
And my life shall behold the light.
Lo, all these things doth God work, 29
Twice, *yea* thrice, with a man,

---

marg. 'And he be gracious unto him, and say,' placing a colon after 'ransom,' instead of a full stop. The angel, it is to be assumed, finding the sufferer amenable to his instruction, takes compassion on him, and intercedes for him. Since he promises to purchase his release, the one to whom his petition is addressed can hardly be God, but the angel of death, who will not let his victim go without an equivalent. In what the ransom consists is not said, but according to xxxvi. 18, it is supposed to be the severe affliction he has endured.

25. Happy issue of his discipline. The description recalls that of Naaman's recovery from leprosy, 2 Kings v. 14. This verse hardly forms part of the angel's address to the angel of death.

26. Possibly the reference is to his return to the Temple services ; to see God's face is used in this sense. And this may explain the reference to his singing before men, which especially reminds us of Ps. xxii. 22, 25, and Isa. xxxviii. 20, in both of which we have praise for deliverance rendered at the point of death.

27. He singeth before men: better than marg. 'He looketh upon men.'

it profited me not: this and the alternative marg. 'it was not meet for me,' are alike to be rejected in favour of the first marg., 'it was not requited me,' though this is itself rather dubious. It must, however, be very near the sense.

29. So mercifully God deals with man ; not, as Merx takes it,

30 To bring back his soul from the pit,
That he may be enlightened with the light of the living.
31 Mark well, O Job, hearken unto me:
Hold thy peace, and I will speak.
32 If thou hast any thing to say, answer me:
Speak, for I desire to justify thee.
33 If not, hearken thou unto me:
Hold thy peace, and I will teach thee wisdom.

34 Moreover Elihu answered and said,

---

so many opportunities and no more, for His patience has its limits.

30. the living: marg. 'life' is better.

31–33. Exhortation to Job to listen to his next speech, and to urge what he can in self-defence. There is no necessity to strike out or transfer to another place all or any of these verses. True, the poet would not have written so.

Elihu's contribution amounts to this, that so far from God dealing with man as Job asserts that He has dealt with him, He seeks to restrain him from evil ways by dreams, and if those fail, by severe sickness, which an angel uses to instruct him, and if this succeeds he is restored by the angel to full health. Of course, the thought is differently worked out, but the night-vision, the angel of instruction, and the disciplinary value of affliction are all present in the first speech of Eliphaz. The angelology, however, is much more developed here.

xxxiv. 1–9. Elihu continues with an appeal for the attention of the wise, that they may reach a right decision. Job has complained that God has defrauded him of his right, and that he is incurably wounded, in spite of his innocence. He is a scorner, a companion of the wicked, for he has denied that religion is profitable.

xxxiv. 10–15. But God cannot do wrong, He renders exact retribution. He is no subject ruler, but the supreme Lord, who might cause mankind to perish by withdrawing His spirit.

xxxiv. 16–28. But injustice is incompatible with rule, and how can one condemn that God in whose sight princes and nobles are wicked, who is no respecter of persons? Suddenly the mighty die, for God sees all things, and has no need to investigate any man's case, but without inquisition supplants the mighty. He strikes

Hear my words, ye wise men ; 2
And give ear unto me, ye that have knowledge.
For the ear trieth words, 3
As the palate tasteth meat.
Let us choose for us that which is right : 4
Let us know among ourselves what is good.
For Job hath said, I am righteous, 5
And God hath taken away my right :
Notwithstanding my right I am *accounted* a liar ; 6
My wound is incurable, *though I am* without transgression.
What man is like Job, 7
Who drinketh up scorning like water ?
Which goeth in company with the workers of iniquity, 8
And walketh with wicked men.

---

the wicked for abandoning His ways and acting so oppressively that the cry of the distressed rose up to God.

xxxiv. 29–37. Is man to condemn God if He remain inactive, setting up the wicked as king? Let Job penitently confess his sin, promise amendment, and ask instruction. Is he to dictate terms to God? The wise will say that Job has spoken without wisdom. Would that his trial might continue to the end, for to his sin he adds rebellious utterances against God.

xxxiv. **2.** The 'wise men' are probably not the friends whom he has so uncomplimentarily addressed. The author is thinking of his readers ; what he intended Elihu to mean is not so clear. It may be no more than a vague rhetorical flourish, but the wise among the bystanders may be intended (cf. verse 34). True, there is no indication in the poem itself that bystanders were present, but the inventor of Elihu may well have imagined other bystanders besides his hero.

3. Borrowed from **xii. 11.**

5. Cf. xiii. 18, xxvii. 2.

6. Marg. as A.V., 'Should I lie against my right?' i.e. am I to plead guilty, when I am really innocent? But the translation in the text is better.

My wound: *lit.* 'mine arrow.' The prefixing of another consonant would give 'my wound' (*maḥătsi*).

7. On this and the next verse cf. Ps. i. 1. On the second line cf. xv. 16, and see Thomson, *Land and the Book*, p. 319.

9 For he hath said, It profiteth a man nothing
That he should delight himself with God.
10 Therefore hearken unto me, ye men of understanding:
Far be it from God, that he should do wickedness;
And from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity.
11 For the work of a man shall he render unto him,
And cause every man to find according to his ways.
12 Yea, of a surety, God will not do wickedly,
Neither will the Almighty pervert judgement.
13 Who gave him a charge over the earth?
Or who hath disposed the whole world?
14 If he set his heart upon man,
If he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath;

---

9. The expression of Job's 'scorning,' i.e. his impious scepticism. Job had not said this in so many words, though his assertion that God slew perfect and wicked without discrimination, still more that the wicked prospered abundantly, makes the statement not unfair. Cf. the Psalms devoted to the problem of suffering (xxxvii, xlix, lxxiii), and especially the wail of the pious, Mal. iii. 14–16. This assertion is discussed in the next chapter.

delight himself with: marg. 'consent with,' see Ps. l. 18.

10–12. Diffuse re-statement of Bildad's maxim, viii. 3.

13. God is not the deputy of a higher power. He is the sovereign ruler, not the satrap of a province, who governs it for self-enrichment without regard for right.

disposed: the marg. 'laid upon him' would yield a better parallel, but 'upon him' should have been expressed. The addition of a single consonant (Budde) would give the sense 'Who observeth the whole world?' Perhaps Duhm is right in transferring 'his heart' from verse 14 to this verse, 'Who setteth his heart on the whole world?' God can see everything that takes place, therefore wrong does not escape Him. See note on 14.

14. The verse is open to several interpretations. We may translate the present text, 'If he set his heart upon himself,' the meaning is then if God thinks of Himself alone and recalls to Himself the breath of life He has imparted to man. The argument would then be God does not act in this selfish way, hence He is righteous; the logic is not flawless. For **set,** however, there is another reading, 'cause to return,' but 'cause his heart to return to himself' is a strange expression. Further, the parallelism

All flesh shall perish together,
And man shall turn again unto dust.
If now *thou hast* understanding, hear this: 16
Hearken to the voice of my words.
Shall even one that hateth right govern? 17
And wilt thou condemn him that is just *and* mighty?

---

suggests that we should have one noun in the second line, not two. When now we take into account the variation in reading, the improbability that 'set' (the word translated 'disposed' in verse 13 is the same as that rendered 'set' here) should occur in two consecutive lines, the consequent probability that 'cause to return' is the original reading here, the unsuitability of 'his heart' to this, and finally the inequality of the parallelism, Duhm's suggestion that 'his heart' has been inserted here after 'set' instead of after 'set' in verse 13 becomes very attractive. We should accordingly read 'If He cause his spirit to return to Him, And gather to Him his breath,' i.e. if God withdraws to Himself the breath He has lent to man; cf. xxxiii. 4 and Eccles. xii. 7, 'the spirit return unto God who gave it'; Ps. civ. 29, 30, especially the words 'thou gatherest in their breath.'

15. If God thus withdraw the breath He has given, man dies and becomes dust again; cf. the two passages last quoted. The thought rests on Gen. ii. 7, man is dust animated by the breath of God, when the breath is taken back, he becomes dust again. The argument is not very clear; verses 14 and 15 might conceivably support verse 13, God is no subordinate ruler, for the whole existence of mankind depends on His good pleasure. More probably the thought is, He supplies to all men of His own spirit, and were He a capricious or unrighteous Deity He might at any moment withdraw the boon of life; that man still lives on proves His benevolent care.

16. Better as marg. 'Only understand.'

17. The fact that God governs means that His rule is righteous, a strange begging of the question. The pious man may laudably assert the righteousness of God's rule, but it is out of place to assert it in an argument, where it is the very point to be proved. Besides, Elihu goes much beyond this, asserting that rule and injustice are things incompatible. That in the long run empires built on wrong fall because of it may be true. Yet we are able to say 'Rome shall perish . . . In the blood that she has spilt,' only because we are assured that the order of the world is moral. But when the previous question is raised, Is it moral? the reply, Rule and injustice cannot go together, is quite wide of the mark.

18 Is it *fit* to say to a king, *Thou art* vile?
Or to nobles, *Ye are* wicked?
19 *How much less to* him that respecteth not the persons of princes,
Nor regardeth the rich more than the poor?
For they all are the work of his hands.
20 In a moment they die, even at midnight;
The people are shaken and pass away,
And the mighty are taken away without hand.

Kipling's 'Lest we forget, lest we forget' is answered by Watson's 'When we forgot, when we forgot.' What retort to Watson does Elihu enable us to make?

18. According to the text the meaning is, None would speak evil of dignities to their face, how much less to God, so great that all human dignities vanish in His sight, and before whom rich and poor stand on a dead level. But with LXX, Vulgate, and many commentators we should change the pointing of the first word, and read 'Who saith to a king, *Thou art* vile, and to nobles, *Ye are* wicked; that respecteth not,' &c. It is God who speaks thus to king and nobles.

vile: Heb. 'belial.'

19. God's impartiality based on the fact that rich and poor alike stand in the same creaturely relation to Him. Or the reference in the third line may be to the king and nobles.

20. The present division is better than that of marg. and A.V. 'and at midnight the people,' &c. The second line is strange. Is the meaning that a whole nation perishes? Marshall explains 'The people are momentarily agitated, but then pass on, and the disaffected ones are forgotten.' He explains the first line of the mysterious ways sovereigns have of removing traitors. But the reference is rather to God's mysterious action (**without hand**). Probably the reference is to the death of rulers. We could insert 'from' before **the people**, with Duhm, 'they are torn away from the people.' But Budde very ingeniously suggests that the last two consonants of the word translated 'shaken' should be written over again (the copyist having written them once instead of twice), and connected with those translated 'people.' We thus get the plural of the word translated 'rich' in the preceding verse (*shō'īm*), 'the rich are shaken and pass away,' which forms a better parallel to the next line.

without hand: by the power of God; cf. xx. 26; Zech. iv. 6; Isa. xxxi. 8; Dan. ii. 34. We are reminded of the death of the

For his eyes are upon the ways of a man, 21
And he seeth all his goings.
There is no darkness, nor shadow of death, 22
Where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves.
For he needeth not further to consider a man, 23
That he should go before God in judgement.
He breaketh in pieces mighty men *in ways* past finding 24
out,
And setteth others in their stead.
Therefore he taketh knowledge of their works; 25
And he overturneth them in the night, so that they are
destroyed.
He striketh them as wicked men 26
In the open sight of others;

---

firstborn, the destruction of Sennacherib's army, Ezekiel's prediction of the overthrow of Gog.

23. The first line is expressed in strange Hebrew. We should, with Budde, Duhm, and Klostermann, accept G. H. B. Wright's excellent emendation *mō'edh* for *'ōdh*, 'For He appointeth no set time for man that he should go before God in judgement.' Marshall's emendation *'ēth* yields the same sense and is supported by xxiv. 1, but is not so easy. Since nothing escapes God's notice, He has no need to have set seasons for investigation, but, as the next verse says, breaks the mighty in pieces without it.

24. *in ways* **past finding out:** much better as in marg. 'without inquisition'; see preceding note.

25. Budde omits 25–28, Duhm omits verse 27 and takes the greater part of verse 25 (as far as 'night') as a gloss on verse 20. We must try, however, to make the best of the present arrangement; not expecting too much.

Therefore is not easy; it seems to invert the logical relation. It would be easier to read 'so' or 'for.'

destroyed: *lit.* 'crushed.'

26. The first line is difficult, since they were sinners in Elihu's view; Bickell, followed by Budde, pointed the word rendered 'as' differently, and made it (*tāḥ'ēth*) a verb, but had then to insert a subject, 'his wrath breaks the wicked.' This had the advantage of liberating 'he striketh' for the second line, which thus attains a normal length. Duhm connects the last word of verse 25 with this verse and reads 'ruins' (*ʾᵉsīsīm*) for 'wicked': 'They are

27 Because they turned aside from following him,
And would not have regard to any of his ways:
28 So that they caused the cry of the poor to come unto him,
And he heard the cry of the afflicted.
29 When he giveth quietness, who then can condemn?
And when he hideth his face, who then can behold him?
Whether *it be done* unto a nation, or unto a man, alike:
30 That the godless man reign not,
That there be none to ensnare the people.

---

crushed under ruins.' The second line represents them as put to death 'in the place of beholders,' i. e. at the place of public execution. G. H. B. Wright, 'in the place of the Rephaim,' i. e. the underworld.

28. The result of their disregard of God's ways was that they oppressed the poor, and thus caused God to hear their cry. The marg. renders 'That they might cause . . . and that he might hear.' In that case the verse connects with verse 26; God punishes the oppressor that He may hear the cry of the oppressed. It would be better to substitute 'he' for 'they.' But is not the hearing of their cry rather the cause than the result of the oppressor's overthrow?

29. With this verse begins an obscure passage, though not incurably corrupt. In the first line we should render 'If He remains quiet,' and the sense of the verse is that if God, as Carlyle said, 'does nothing,' i. e. does not intervene to hinder wrong, man has no right to condemn Him. 'Blind unbelief is sure to err.' The hiding of His face expresses the same meaning as His keeping quiet.

behold him: this may be correct, but the parallelism suggests another word expressive of condemnation. Budde aptly suggests 'blame him' (*y^eyass^errennū* for *y^eshūrennū*).

The third line is regarded as a gloss by Budde. Duhm begins a new sentence with it, but for 'alike' (*yāḥad*) reads 'he watches' (*yā'ūr*), 'But he watches over nation and men, That one of them that ensnare the people may not reign' (omitting 'the godless man' as a gloss explaining what the ensnarers of the people are).

30. This could be connected with the preceding verse only by violence. God's inactivity ought hardly to be regarded as meant to prevent the reign of the godless. We might take it as Duhm (see preceding note). Or we might with Theodotion and the Targum read *mamlīkh* for *mimm^elōkh*, 'If He cause a godless man to reign, One of them that ensnare the people.' This, then,

For hath any said unto God, 31
I have borne *chastisement*, I will not offend *any more*:
That which I see not teach thou me: 32
If I have done iniquity, I will do it no more?
Shall his recompence be as thou wilt, that thou refusest it? 33
For thou must choose, and not I:
Therefore speak what thou knowest.
Men of understanding will say unto me, 34
Yea, every wise man that heareth me:
Job speaketh without knowledge, 35
And his words are without wisdom.
Would that Job were tried unto the end, 36
Because of his answering like wicked men.

---

would connect with verse 29 as an instance of God's hiding His face.

31, 32. A difficult passage. Does it mean, Who but Job ever criticized God's action in punishing him when innocent, and promised to sin no more, if only his sin could be shown him? Or is the confession a pious one and the meaning, Such a pious confession Job has not made? Or should we regard verses 31 and 32 as completed by verse 33, translating, 'And if one say unto God . . . Shall his recompence, &c.'? The text is not above suspicion, the interrogative stands in an unusual place. A different division of the consonants removes this difficulty, and we may, with some other emendations, read with Ley, 'But say unto Eloah, I have borne my sin, I will not do evil any more, What I see not, &c.' The words thus become an exhortation to Job.

33. Continuing his exhortation by the scornful question if Job is to dictate terms to God.

Instead of 'not I' it would be far better, with Ley, to read 'not God'; you, forsooth, and not God, must choose! Marshall reaches substantially the same sense with the present text: 'Elihu says, "Not I," as if he were speaking in the name of God.'

36. After the decision of the 'wise men' in verse 35, Elihu resumes, though possibly the quotation is continued to the end of the chapter. In any case the sentiments are Elihu's. He would have him kept on the rack till he changed his tone. This verse and the following seem to show that Elihu charges Job, as the friends had done, (*a*) with sin which had caused his punishment, (*b*) with rebellious language against God under his punishment.

37 For he addeth rebellion unto his sin,
He clappeth his hands among us,
And multiplieth his words against God.

35 Moreover Elihu answered and said,

Budde holds strongly that Elihu attacks Job for his rebellious speeches only, and says that if the usual view were correct the verse would have to be struck out. It is certainly no argument for this that the wise men base their judgement only on what they know, i. e. Job's speeches. For they know also his calamities, and were as likely as the friends to infer his sin from them. That Elihu attributed Job's sufferings to God's design of bringing to consciousness Job's spiritual pride is a view of Budde's that few are able to accept. It may be granted, however, that 'sin' and 'rebellion' are not necessarily to be sharply distinguished, the expression meaning simply that he heaps sin upon sin, but this is, all the same, unlikely.

37. clappeth his hands: in insult. 'His hands' is not expressed, however. Marshall translates 'pours forth.' Duhm and Ley omit.

Elihu's position in this chapter is substantially that of the friends. The Ruler of the universe cannot be unjust. Such proof as he offers is weak. The gift of life and its preservation may prove the benevolence of God, but they might be accounted for by self-seeking aims, and benevolence does not readily explain life's misery. That government cannot be founded on injustice is simply asserted, Job's proofs to the contrary are ignored. God's omniscience had been confessed quite freely by Job, but it made the problem more difficult rather than more simple. The exhortation to Job is conceived in a spirit more reprehensible even than that of the friends.

xxxv. 1–8. Elihu asks Job if his righteousness before God finds expression in his question whether righteousness is profitable. Look at the skies and see how exalted God is. Man's sin or righteousness cannot injure or profit Him, but only his fellow man.

xxxv. 9–16. Men cry out because they suffer from oppression. But they do not inquire for God, who gives songs in the night of sorrow, who makes us wiser than beast or bird. They cry out because of the pride of the wicked, but God does not answer. No, God certainly will not regard vanity. How much less will He regard Job when he complains of His delay. Let him be silent before God, and wait His time. But Job argues that be-

Thinkest thou this to be *thy* right, 2
Or sayest thou, My righteousness is more than God's,
That thou sayest, What advantage will it be unto thee? 3
And, What profit shall I have, more than if I had sinned?
I will answer thee, 4
And thy companions with thee.
Look unto the heavens, and see; 5
And behold the skies, which are higher than thou.

---

cause God does not punish rebellion He makes light of it. So Job utters foolish and empty words.

2. this refers to what is to follow in verse 3. The second line might be better translated 'And callest it my righteousness before God.' Is the question in verse 3 a sample of that righteousness of which he boasts? No truly righteous person could ask such a question.

3. unto thee: not God, but his antagonist. He might mean, What advantage have you from your righteousness; the speech may be indirect in this line, and direct in the next, so that 'thee' and 'I' both mean Job. It would be much simpler to read 'me' for 'thee.'

4. companions: it is not clear whether the reference is to the three friends, or to those who shared Job's view. That Elihu proceeds to appropriate the thoughts of the friends is no proof that he cannot be professing to instruct them; such conduct would be quite characteristic of him. Budde omits the verse. Marshall ingeniously suggests that Elihu first quotes the opinions of the friends and then (verses 9–13) refutes them. But the two views, that God gains or loses nothing by man's conduct, and that He teaches and comforts man, stand in no opposition to each other. It is only when the former thought is extended to an assertion of God's complete indifference to man that any contradiction emerges. Eliphaz affirmed that man's righteousness did not profit God, and yet depicted in exquisite language God's tenderness to man (v. 18 ff.). Besides, the thought that man's sin cannot hurt God is expressed by Job himself (vii. 20), yet he accuses God in the same breath, not of indifference, but of malignant, incessant watchfulness. The thought of God's exaltation is also very congenial to Elihu. We should therefore conclude that he is giving his own answer, in the following verses, to the question in verse 3.

5. An echo of xxii. 12, cf. xi. 7–9. God is too high for man's deeds to profit or injure Him.

6 If thou hast sinned, what doest thou against him?
And if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him?
7 If thou be righteous, what givest thou him?
Or what receiveth he of thine hand?
8 Thy wickedness *may hurt* a man as thou art;
And thy righteousness *may profit* a son of man.
9 By reason of the multitude of oppressions they cry out;
They cry for help by reason of the arm of the mighty.
10 But none saith, Where is God my Maker,
Who giveth songs in the night;
11 Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth,
And maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven?
12 There they cry, but none giveth answer,
Because of the pride of evil men.

6–8. Repetition of xxii. 2, 3, with expression of the contrast in conduct and in person affected. Cf. Job's own utterance, vii. 20. Self-interest is accordingly not present in God as a disturbing influence to entice Him from the path of justice. He must therefore treat men according to their deserts; righteousness *pays*.

Duhm places verse 16 after verse 8, bringing verse 15 in close connexion with xxxvi. 2. He also places verse 9 after verse 11, but then strikes out verses 9, 12 as a gloss on xxxvi. 7 ff.

9. But if God's rule is righteous, why the cry of the oppressed?

10. The reason is that their cry is not the cry for God, but simply for relief. Suffering should send man to God. The second line is beautiful, worthy of the poet himself. If the author could only have kept at this height! Even in the dark hours of pain, God fills the sufferer with rapture, that bursts instinctively into songs of praise. So Paul and Silas in prison.

11. Contrast xii. 7, 8, where it is suggested that the beasts and birds can teach concerning the ways of God. But God makes us wiser even than He makes them. An antique view of the animal creation shines through (see note on xxviii. 7). Naturally the meaning is not that God teaches us more than the animals teach us.

12. The sense would be clearer with a change in the order, 'There they cry because of the pride of evil men, but none giveth answer' (marg. 'but he answereth not').

Surely God will not hear vanity, 13
Neither will the Almighty regard it.
How much less when thou sayest thou beholdest him not, 14
The cause is before him, and thou waitest for him!
But now, because he hath not visited in his anger, 15
Neither doth he greatly regard arrogance;
Therefore doth Job open his mouth in vanity; 16
He multiplieth words without knowledge.

---

13. The cry is not heard, because it is 'vanity'; there is the element of unreality in it, so far as while it is in earnest for help, it is a cry to God with no genuine religious element in it.

14. The translation in the text means, If God will not hear 'vanity,' how much less will He listen to you, when you complain that you cannot see Him, and that, while you have presented your case, He keeps you waiting for His answer. Such irreligion deserves to receive no response. The marg. is perhaps to be preferred, 'How much less when thou sayest thou beholdest him not! The cause is before him; therefore wait thou for him.' Elihu, after explaining the delay by Job's complaint against God, encourages him by the reminder that his case is before God, and exhorts him to wait for His decision. But we should probably, with Perles, read 'Silence before Him' (*dōm* for *dīn*), cf. Ps. xxxvii. 7.

15. The translation in the text makes verse 16 the completion of the sentence begun in verse 15, and this view is taken by several scholars. So far as the words go the reference might then be to Job's escape from anger, and the meaning would be that he takes advantage of God's forbearance. But he had been visited in anger already. The meaning would accordingly have to be that God's failure to punish iniquity led Job to indulge in unbecoming criticism. The marg. is probably to be preferred, according to which verse 15 is complete in itself, 'But now, because he hath not visited in his anger, *Thou sayest*, He doth not greatly regard arrogance. Thus doth Job, &c.' Job infers from God's failure to punish arrogance that it gave Him no concern. This yields good sense. The word translated 'arrogance' occurs nowhere else. Probably we should read 'rebellion' as in xxxiv. 37 (*pesha'* for *pash*).

16. Elihu's verdict on Job's criticism of the Divine government.

In this speech Elihu deals with two questions, What is the profit of righteousness? and Why does not God hear the cry of the oppressed? The former he answers on lines already laid

36 Elihu also proceeded, and said,
2 Suffer me a little, and I will shew thee;
For I have yet somewhat to say on God's behalf.
3 I will fetch my knowledge from afar,
And will ascribe righteousness to my Maker.
4 For truly my words are not false:
One that is perfect in knowledge is with thee.
5 Behold, God is mighty, and despiseth not any:
He is mighty in strength of understanding.

---

down by Eliphaz. God is too exalted to be profited by man's righteousness or injured by his sin. Therefore His retributive justice is not perverted by self-interest, accordingly the righteous will gain the due profit from their conduct. Obviously this did not at all meet Job's case. To the second question he gives a reply of his own. The oppressed cry to God from self-regarding, not from religious motives. He does not see that while this is true in certain instances, there are numerous cases, Job's among them, to which it does not apply.

xxxvi. 1–4. Elihu has still something to add for God, derived from a comprehensive survey of the universe, let Job listen, for he speaks truly and with perfect knowledge.

xxxvi. 5–12. God is mighty, but despises none. He does not preserve the wicked, but He exalts the righteous. He may afflict them, but it is for their instruction, that they may see themselves to have acted proudly. If they listen to His admonitions they shall prosper, but if not they shall perish.

xxxvi. 13–21. If they cherish angry thoughts they die before their time. By affliction God delivers the afflicted and opens their ear to His teaching. So might it be with Job. But he is filled with the judgement of the wicked. Let not his sufferings lead him astray. Suffering is indispensable. Let him not long for the calamity that overwhelms nations; nor regard iniquity, which he is preferring to affliction.

2. Suffer: *lit.* 'wait for.' The second line is literally 'For *there are* yet words for God.'

3. By a comprehensive survey of the universe he will establish God's righteousness. This is, of course, the chief aim of his speeches.

4. Extravagant self-praise even for an Orienta., the more pitiful that the speeches themselves give the lie to his claim.

5. God's might is not associated with contempt for the weak.

He preserveth not the life of the wicked :
But giveth to the afflicted *their* right.
He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous : 7
But with kings upon the throne
He setteth them for ever, and they are exalted.
And if they be bound in fetters, 8
And be taken in the cords of affliction ;
Then he sheweth them their work, 9
And their transgressions, that they have behaved themselves proudly.
He openeth also their ear to instruction, 10
And commandeth that they return from iniquity.
If they hearken and serve *him*, 11
They shall spend their days in prosperity,
And their years in pleasures.
But if they hearken not, they shall perish by the sword, 12
And they shall die without knowledge.
But they that are godless in heart lay up anger : 13

The second line should probably read 'He is mighty in strength and understanding' (Ley), or perhaps 'He is mighty in strength and wise of understanding' (Budde). **Understanding** is literally 'heart.' Duhm by elimination of variants and emendation reduces the two lines to one, 'See, God despises the stubborn of heart.' It would improve the connexion and parallelism with what follows if we could accept this, but the change involved is considerable.

7. For **his eyes** we should probably read, with the LXX, 'right.'

8. Those who are thus bound in the fetters of affliction seem to be the righteous. While God does exalt the righteous there are cases where they fall into trouble.

9. God's purpose in their affliction, to bring them to a knowledge of their sin.

11. pleasures: marg. 'pleasantness.' For verses 11, 12 cf. Isa. i. 19, 20.

12. the sword: marg. 'weapons.' Duhm reads 'to Sheol' as in xxxiii. 18.

13. Budde strikes out this verse and the following, on insufficient grounds. The words **lay up anger** are difficult, and

They cry not for help when he bindeth them.
14 They die in youth,
And their life *perisheth* among the unclean.
15 He delivereth the afflicted by his affliction,
And openeth their ear in oppression.
16 Yea, he would have led thee away out of distress

---

many explanations have been given. The meaning seems to be that instead of accepting God's discipline in the right spirit they cherish angry thoughts about it. The second line describes their sullen demeanour under it; they will not cry to God for help.

14. *Lit.* 'their soul dieth in youth.'

among: marg. 'like,' which at any rate represents the meaning.

unclean: marg. 'sodomites,' see Deut. xxiii. 17. The word literally means 'consecrated ones.' They were dedicated to the service of impurity at the temples, and their early death, due to unnatural vice, seems to have become proverbial.

15. by his affliction is much better than the marg. 'in his affliction.' On the other hand, it would be better to substitute the marg. 'by adversity' for **in oppression.**

16-19. These verses are notoriously difficult, through ambiguity in the expressions employed, coupled with corruption of the text. The R. V. translation gives a smooth, easy sense for verse 16. Affliction is designed to lead the sufferer to deliverance (verse 15). Yes, so it would have been with Job, God would have led him from distress into abundance (verse 16). But it is possible, keeping this general sense, to take the verse as expressing not what God would have done, but what He is doing, and translate 'yea, he allureth thee.' The words rendered **out of distress** are literally 'out of the mouth of distress.' An entirely different meaning can be given to the verse if we translate, 'And thee hath unconstrained freedom led away from the mouth of distress, and the peacefulness (or plenty) of thy table which is full of fatness.' 'The mouth of distress' must then be explained as the cry for help in trouble addressed to God; and the verse will mean that Job's prosperity had caused him to forget God; he does not utter to Him the cry which distress would have forced from him. But apart from other difficulties the sense imposed on 'the mouth of distress' is barely possible. Duhm gets a similar general sense, avoiding the difficulty by transposition of the words, 'But freedom hath led thee away and rest from the mouth of distress, no trouble to terrify thee, and thy table full of fatness.' The word translated 'to terrify thee' is an emendation for that rendered **where there is** (*lit.* 'beneath it').

led thee away: marg. 'allured thee,' similarly verse 18.

Into a broad place, where there is no straitness;
And that which is set on thy table should be full of fatness.
But thou art full of the judgement of the wicked: 17
Judgement and justice take hold *on thee*.
Because there is wrath, beware lest thou be led away by 18
thy sufficiency;
Neither let the greatness of the ransom turn thee aside.

---

17. This verse is very ambiguous. **The judgement of the wicked** may be either the condemnation of God uttered by the wicked, or the condemnation which overtakes the wicked. The latter seems to be the sense intended by R.V., and the connexion with verse 16 will then be, God would have led you out of distress into happiness, but, as it is, you are visited by His condemnation. If the former view is taken, the second line will form the apodosis to the first, and the meaning will be, But if you are full of wicked complaints about God, His judgements will overtake you. In that case the connexion seems to be, God is alluring you by suffering to happiness, but if you impiously complain He will condemn you. If we take verse 16 in an unfavourable sense, then this verse simply continues, and for **But** we should substitute 'And.' The connexion with verse 16 will then be, Prosperity has led you astray, and God's judgements have overtaken you. Budde omits the verse.

art full of: better than marg. 'hast filled up.'

18. The second line is fairly clear, Do not let the greatness of the ransom you have to pay, i.e. your severe sufferings (xxxiii. 24), turn you from the right path. The general sense of the first line is the same, but opinions vary much on details of interpretation. According to R.V. text, the wrath is the anger of God. The meaning seems to be, Seeing that there is such a thing as God's anger to be reckoned with, take care not to be led astray by your sufficiency. Since **sufficiency** gives no suitable sense, it would be better to read 'beware lest thou be led away into mockery.' The words might also mean, Do not, because God's anger is afflicting you, let yourself give way to mockery of Him. The parallelism favours this interpretation. The marg. takes the wrath to be Job's, 'For beware lest wrath lead thee away into mockery.' The parallelism with **ransom**, however, suggests that the reference is to Job's suffering from God's wrath, not to the angry emotions that his suffering excites, besides, the anger, as well as the mockery, would surely be reprehensible. We might, however, substitute the translation 'chastisement' for

19 Will thy riches suffice, *that thou be* not in distress,
Or all the forces of *thy* strength?
20 Desire not the night,
When peoples are cut off in their place.
21 Take heed, regard not iniquity:
For this hast thou chosen rather than affliction.

'sufficiency,' and with a slight emendation render 'Let not chastisement entice thee to wrath.'

19. The R.V. text seems to imply a reason for verse 18. Do not let the severity of your afflictions lead you astray, no smaller 'ransom' will suffice, neither wealth nor power, to rescue you from suffering. The marg. for *that thou be* **not in distress** renders 'that are without stint.' A third translation is possible 'Will thy riches suffice, without distress?' i.e. suffering is indispensable. The word rendered 'riches' may also mean 'cry,' hence the R.V. marg. 'Will thy cry avail, that thou be not in distress?' Neither cries nor your utmost efforts will deliver you. It would also be possible to make God the subject of the verb translated 'suffice,' and take the latter in its more usual sense to set in order, 'Will He set in order thy cry without distress?' i.e. Can God make your rebellious cry one of submission without afflicting you?

20. This verse also is very difficult. The translation seems to be a warning to Job not to long for the night of calamity when nations are suddenly cut off. But what should put such a strange desire into his mind? We might perhaps compare xviii. 4, 'shall the earth be forsaken for thee?' It can hardly be that Job desires a calamity to come upon nations that he may be destroyed; he could be destroyed without this. Rather, it is a calamity to come upon nations that some advantage may accrue to himself. Not only is this an extraordinary sentence in itself, but it is not easy to see any connexion with the context. Budde gives up the second line as hopelessly corrupt. The first he then explains, 'Do not long for death'; Job had more than once expressed the passionate wish that God would kill him out of hand. Duhm with some emendation gets the sense 'Let not folly beguile thee to exalt thyself with him that thinks himself wise.' This would suit the context much better. **are cut off** is literally 'to go up,' which might mean to exalt oneself. Ley reads 'perish.'

21. The sense is probably that given by R.V. Instead of **this** we should probably read 'wickedness' (*'awlāh* = *'awlāh* for *'al-zeh*). Affliction he should have gladly received at God's hands, especially in view of its blessed results. Some think we should substitute 'submissiveness.'

Behold, God doeth loftily in his power: 22
Who is a teacher like unto him?
Who hath enjoined him his way? 23
Or who can say, Thou hast wrought unrighteousness?
Remember that thou magnify his work, 24
Whereof men have sung.

In this section Elihu dwells on the value of suffering as discipline, and warns Job not to take it wrongly but humbly submit, else it will go worse with him. Substantially there is no advance made here.

xxxvi. 22–26. God is great and wise, who can command or criticize Him? Let Job magnify His work. He is beyond our comprehension.

xxxvi. 27–33. He draws up the water, and lets it pour down in rain. Who can understand the distribution of the clouds, the thunders in His pavilion? He is surrounded with light; judges and blesses the nations; sends the lightning to its mark, and makes His anger glow against iniquity.

xxxvii. 1–13. Elihu trembles at the thought of this. Listen to the thunder. The lightning flashes across the whole sky, and God's marvellous voice follows in the pealing thunder. His doings are incomprehensible. He sends snow and rain, stopping man's labour and driving the beasts to their dens. The storm comes from the chamber, the cold from its storehouse, and ice is formed by His breath. He fills the cloud with moisture, the lightning is guided by His direction to accomplish His destructive or merciful purposes.

xxxvii. 14–18. Let Job consider God's marvellous works. Does he comprehend these wonders? the flashing forth of the lightning, the poising of the clouds, the heat and stillness that accompany the sirocco? Can he beat out the sky firm as a metal mirror?

xxxvii. 19–24. How address a Being so great? How could one court destruction by presumptuously wishing to speak with Him? Man cannot see the dazzling light when the sky is cleared of clouds; golden radiance streams from the north, God's majesty is terrible. The Almighty is unsearchable, great in power, yet perfectly just. Men should fear Him, He has no regard for those wise in their own conceit.

xxxvi. **22.** With this begins the description of God's greatness and wisdom, which forms the concluding section of Elihu's contribution.

24. The author was very likely a Psalmist himself.

25 All men have looked thereon ;
Man beholdeth it afar off.
26 Behold, God is great, and we know him not ;
The number of his years is unsearchable.
27 For he draweth up the drops of water,
Which distil in rain from his vapour :
28 Which the skies pour down
And drop upon man abundantly.
29 Yea, can any understand the spreadings of the clouds,
The thunderings of his pavilion ?
30 Behold, he spreadeth his light around him ;

---

25. God's work is far too great for man to see it close at hand ; cf. xxvi. 14. Budde strikes out the verse, merely because he thinks the connexion is better without verses 25, 26.

26. Both Budde and Duhm omit the first line as too like verse 22^a, the second as introducing a thought foreign to the context.

27. Elihu shows the greatness of God by reference to the wonders of the sky. First he names the raindrops. The meaning seems to be that the water is drawn up from the sea, and poured out as raindrops from the vapour of the clouds (marg. 'the vapour thereof').

28. Better 'and drop upon many men.'

29. Budde omits this verse and the following, quite unnecessarily. The distribution of the clouds in the sky is to Elihu a mysterious phenomenon. We should probably read, with Siegfried, 'yea, who understands.' According to Ps. xviii. 11, the darkness of the thunder-cloud is the pavilion in which God is hidden. Hence the crashing thunder within it is described as **The thunderings of his pavilion.** Probably the expression is borrowed from Ps. xviii. 11, as it is not very intelligible in itself, and only becomes so on reference to that passage.

30. God hides Himself in His pavilion where the thunder crashes and the lightnings play, thus He is Himself surrounded with light, the flashes which leap from the clouds being mere hints of the brilliance within, sparks from the central fire. The second line is difficult. That God should cover the bottom (*lit.* the roots) of the sea is a strange statement, it is covered already, and this objection is not removed if we explain the sea as the heavenly ocean. The marg. 'covereth *it* with the depths of the sea,' would apparently mean that God covers the light with water drawn up from the depths of the sea to form clouds, which suits

And he covereth the bottom of the sea.
For by these he judgeth the peoples; 31
He giveth meat in abundance.
He covereth his hands with the lightning; 32
And giveth it a charge that it strike the mark.

---

the rest of the description, but is very far-fetched. When we remember that the author has just quoted from Ps. xviii, the probability is that he is here also drawing on the same source. There, as an effect of the thunder-storm, it is described how the ocean bed was laid bare. We may read then here, with Budde, 'And the roots of the sea he lays bare.' **covereth** may have intruded here from verse 32. Marshall's suggestion, 'the roots of the sea are his throne,' is nearer the Hebrew and very ingenious. He takes the sea to be the heavenly ocean, and its roots as 'the seven mountains which were thought to surround the earth.' Duhm thinks the verse carries on the thought of 29[a], and reads 'Behold, he spreadeth his cloud about him, And he covereth the tops of the mountains.'

around him: marg. 'thereon.'

31. The verse breaks the connexion between verses 30 and 32. One may reasonably suspect it to be a later insertion. It would be more in place after verse 28. The judgement of the nations in itself suggests a theophany, descriptions of which are largely elemental in the O. T. We might compare Ps. xviii, or Hab. iii. This suits the present position of the line fairly well. But the reference to the bountiful supply of food in the second line should stand in connexion with the fertilizing rain. And what is the relation between the two lines? Is it antithetic, referring on one side to God's judgements executed in a theophany, and on the other to His care for His creatures? Or has the judgement both a saving and a destructive side? or is the judgement synonymous with the giving of food?

32. This verse is difficult, but the R. V. probably gives the sense approximately. What is meant is that God fills His hands with the lightning (*lit.* 'light') and hurls the deadly shaft of light home to its mark. But the author says, He covers His hands, to make it plain that while it is His hands that speed the bolt, the light, in which they are shrouded, conceals them from human eyes. It seemed profane to the thought of antiquity to see the Divine at work. Several other views are taken, but it is best to abide by this, nor is it necessary to make radical alterations in the text.

that it strike the mark: the marg. 'against the assailant' is the better translation of the Hebrew text; but with Olshausen

33 The noise thereof telleth concerning him,
The cattle also concerning *the storm* that cometh up.
37 1 At this also my heart trembleth,
And is moved out of its place.
2 Hearken ye unto the noise of his voice,
And the sound that goeth out of his mouth.
3 He sendeth it forth under the whole heaven,
And his lightning unto the ends of the earth.
4 After it a voice roareth;
He thundereth with the voice of his majesty:
And he stayeth them not when his voice is heard.

---

and several scholars it is preferable to read a slightly different word, and translate as in R. V. text.

33. More than thirty explanations have been given of this verse. **him** is better than the marg. 'it,' and the first line is plain, the thunder tells of God. The second line is difficult. It makes little difference whether we read *the storm* **that cometh up** or 'him that cometh up,' since if the latter is adopted, and it seems preferable, the reference is to God coming up in the storm. The explanation is given that the cattle, in virtue of a greater sensitiveness to atmospheric influences, exhibit an uneasiness which is a presage of the storm. It is also possible to translate 'unto the cattle,' in which case the meaning is that the cattle learn from the thunder concerning him that cometh up. Neither interpretation is satisfactory. The cattle are a disturbing element here, and 'him that cometh up' is a very strange phrase. In an unpointed text the latter word would be more naturally taken to mean 'wickedness,' while the word translated **cattle** might be pointed so as to mean 'kindling.' The word translated **also** is a common word for 'anger.' Accordingly we should read 'kindling his anger against iniquity,' so most scholars.

xxxvii. **2.** This verse especially makes on many the impression that a thunderstorm was in progress while Elihu was speaking, and in this is seen a preparation for the manifestation of Yahweh in xxxviii. 1. If the author really intended this, he has carried out his intention inartistically, for he wanders from the thunderstorm to ice, snow, and rain.

sound: better as marg. 'muttering.'

3. lightning: *lit.* 'light.'

ends: *lit.* 'skirts.'

4. The thunder follows the lightning. In the third line we

God thundereth marvellously with his voice; 5
Great things doeth he, which we cannot comprehend.
For he saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth; 6
Likewise to the shower of rain,
And to the showers of his mighty rain.
He sealeth up the hand of every man; 7
That all men whom he hath made may know *it*.
Then the beasts go into coverts, 8
And remain in their dens.
Out of the chamber *of the south* cometh the storm: 9
And cold out of the north.
By the breath of God ice is given: 10

---

should perhaps read with Budde, 'And he stayeth not the lightnings when, &c.'

6. Fall: so most scholars. The meaning, however, is questionable. Several read 'water the earth' (*rawwēh*), cf. Isa. lv. 10; Ps. lxv. 9. There has almost certainly been mistaken repetition in the second and third lines. Perhaps the best reconstruction is 'To the shower and rain Be mighty.'

7, 8. Snows and rain stop outdoor work, and drive the beasts to their dens, where they are forced to remain. A slight alteration would give the sense 'He shutteth men up' (*bᵉ 'adh* for *bᵉyādh*). So Duhm. It is amusing that the line has been regarded as a justification of palmistry.

9. In ix. 9 we read of 'the chambers of the south,' and the R.V. rendering has been influenced by this. There is no reference to the south here, nor is there any certain reference to **the north** in the second line, the word so translated probably meaning literally 'the scatterers,' which the marg. interprets as the 'scattering *winds*.' It is much more likely that **the chamber** is just the home in which the whirlwind was thought to dwell. And for the barely intelligible 'scatterers' in the second line it would be far better, with a trifling alteration, to read 'granaries' as proposed by Voigt. It was thought that wind, snow, hail, &c., were laid up in storehouses ready for God's use at any time when He needed them (cf. xxxviii. 22, 23; Ps. cxxxv. 7). This is the meaning here of 'chamber' and 'granaries.' Duhm inserts 'the south' in the text of the first line, and, retaining the text of the second, thinks of 'the scatterers' as a constellation. The Vulgate, and perhaps the LXX, identified them with Arcturus.

10. The nipping winter winds are apparently identified with

And the breadth of the waters is straitened.
11 Yea, he ladeth the thick cloud with moisture;
He spreadeth abroad the cloud of his lightning:
12 And it is turned round about by his guidance,
That they may do whatsoever he commandeth them
Upon the face of the habitable world:
13 Whether it be for correction, or for his land,
Or for mercy, that he cause it to come.
14 Hearken unto this, O Job:
Stand still, and consider the wondrous works of God.
15 Dost thou know how God layeth *his charge* upon them,

---

the breath of God, which touches the rivers, so that they shrink as the ice covers them. But the marg. 'congealed' is better.

11. Possibly (with Duhm) we should read 'hail' for **moisture** (*bārādh* for *b^{e}rī*). But the present text may be defended by xxvi. 8. Budde suggests as a possibility 'with his light,' which would suit the reference to lightning in the next line, where we should perhaps read 'the cloud scattereth His lightning.'

12. Not the cloud, but the lightning, the same verb being used of the whirling fiery sword which, along with the cherubim, barred the way to the tree of life (Gen. iii. 24). And though the forked lightning seems to men's eyes wholly capricious in its random movements, yet it does not strike blindly, but is guided in every flash by the counsels of God. Probably the first line originally formed a couplet, and we should restore a verb corresponding to **it is turned**, perhaps 'And it moves round about, Turned by his counsels.'

13. The text is probably in disorder. It is clear that **land** (marg. 'earth') cannot form a third alternative to **correction** and **mercy**. It is simplest to delete **or** before **for his land** as mistaken repetition, translating 'Whether it be for correction for his land.' Duhm reads 'Whether it be for correction or for curse'; he compares Enoch lix. Budde strikes out the verse, because the connexion with verse 11 is not easy, and yet the reference to 'blessing' suits the clouds better than the lightning. It all depends on the point of view. The O. T. theophanies, in which lightning frequently plays a part, were often merciful to Israel, because destructive to its foes. And the passage quoted by Duhm from Enoch refers to the lightning as sent 'for blessing and for curse as the Lord of the spirits wills.'

15. In imitation of the ironical questions in the Divine speeches,

And causeth the lightning of his cloud to shine?
Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, 16
The wondrous works of him which is perfect in knowledge?
How thy garments are warm, 17
When the earth is still by reason of the south *wind*?
Canst thou with him spread out the sky, 18

---

the author represents Elihu as plying Job with a series of questions intended to convict him of his ignorance. Budde strikes out verses 15, 16 on account of the lack of clearness and relation to the speeches of Yahweh. But few will agree that verse 17 fits on to verse 14 better than to verse 16, on the contrary, the difficulty of this connexion is decisive against the elimination of the intervening verses.

upon them: the reference is uncertain. Some think it is to the clouds, but more probably it is to the whole series of phenomena he has been describing. Bickell and Duhm follow the LXX in reading 'when God doeth his works.'

16. balancings: the word occurs only here, the meaning seems to be that the clouds are poised free in the sky, laden with moisture (verse 11), yet floating there without support. There is no need to read 'spreadings' as in xxxvi. 29. The words differ only by one letter, but 'spreadings' occurs only in that passage. For the second line Duhm reads 'That pours down a deluge mid thunder' (*mappîl tehōm mᵉra'am*). This gives an admirable sense, the clouds swing in the sky as if they were light as air, yet are filled with such a weight of water that they can discharge a deluge of rain. Something like this may be what the author *ought* to have written, the corrections required are not beyond belief, but they are enough to prevent any confident acceptance.

17. A very vivid touch based on the actual experience of a sirocco. For the sensation of hot clothes, and the absolute stillness of nature, see Thomson, *Land and the Book*, p. 537. The marg. renders 'Thou whose garments,' but we might perhaps still better translate 'What time thy garments.' In the second line the text is to be preferred to marg. 'When he quieteth the earth by the south *wind*.'

18. The reference is uncertain. Budde, taking the whole passage as describing the atmospheric phenomena that were taking place while Elihu was speaking, culminating in the theophany, thinks that the clouds hang low, flat and leaden, over the earth. The question is taken to mean, Can you make the round vault of the sky like a flat mirror? It is, however, very questionable whether the general view is correct, and the solidity implied

Which is strong as a molten mirror?
19 Teach us what we shall say unto him;
For we cannot order *our speech* by reason of darkness.
20 Shall it be told him that I would speak?
Or should a man wish that he were swallowed up?
21 And now men see not the light which is bright in the skies:
But the wind passeth, and cleanseth them.

---

in the description does not suit the clouds. It is the firmament that is meant, as is shown by the verb translated 'spread out,' of which the Hebrew word for 'firmament' is the cognate noun. This noun means something beaten out, and the Hebrews thought of the vault of heaven as a solid expanse, firmly fixed, not like the swiftly-moving ever-changing clouds. The molten mirror was made of highly polished metal; here not the flatness but the firmness of the metal and the glitter of the surface are included in the comparison with the copper sky. Cf. Deut. xxviii. 23. Duhm places the verse before verse 21.

with him: not as His fellow workman, but like Him.

19. Awed by these instances of God's might that have crowded into his mind, Elihu asks how fitly we may address Him, with minds confused by the darkness beneath whose pall we move. The darkness is not physical, but mental.

20. Elihu would not dare permit that any message should be carried to God, saying that he wished to speak with Him. This would be tantamount to inviting destruction. If the text is right, there seems to be a reference to Job's oft-expressed wish to speak with God. Elihu is piously glad to be preserved from such uncanny presumption. By the omission of one consonant and the change of first into third person Duhm gets the sense 'Shall one cavil at Him when He speaketh, or does a man say that He errs?' (*yissōr* for *yᵉsuppar*). The marg. renders 'If a man speak, surely he shall be swallowed up.'

21. The meaning of the R.V. text seems to be that men cannot, on account of the intervening clouds, see the sunlight which shines above them, but a wind comes and clears the clouds away, then the light is seen. But the implied inference that the darkness which at present shrouds God's ways will soon be dissipated ('God is His own interpreter, And He will make it plain') is rather negatived by what follows. Besides, the contrast would naturally require a change in the tense. It has already been said that we should not regard this passage as describing the atmospheric phenomena during the latter part of Elihu's speech, hence that explanation should be set aside here also. We should

Out of the north cometh golden splendour : 22
God hath upon him terrible majesty.
Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out ; he is 23
excellent in power :
And in judgement and plenteous justice he will not
afflict.

translate as in the marg. 'And now men cannot look on the light when it is bright in the skies, when the wind hath passed, and cleansed them,' i. e. the light, when the sky is cleared of clouds, is too dazzling for men to look at.

22. The thought of the passage is, the light is too dazzling for men's eyes, how then can they look upon God? The first line may continue the description in verse 21, adding to the general mention of the dazzling light the special feature of the golden splendour that streams out of the north. The view that light comes from the north because the north wind clears away the clouds clashes with Prov. xxv. 23, 'the north wind bringeth forth rain.' The north was regarded in post-exilic Judaism as the home of God, as the Babylonians also thought (Isa. xiv. 13). The 'golden splendour' is probably therefore not to be identified with the 'light' of verse 21, but a radiance which was supposed to stream into the world from the throne of God, and give hints of the awful splendour in which He dwelt. The physical phenomenon, which has for the author this supernatural significance, was probably the Aurora Borealis. The mysterious Northern Lights may well have seemed to have their source in the dwelling-place of God.

golden splendour : *lit.* 'gold' ; but the view that gold is meant, and that the thought is, man can get gold from the almost inaccessible north, but he cannot find God (cf. ch. xxviii), introduces a reference alien to the context, and a connexion of gold with the north, for which no O. T. parallel can be quoted. Probably the R.V. gives the sense ; Duhm thinks the word can hardly bear this meaning, so reads with a trifling change (*zōhar* for *zāhāb*) 'brightness.'

23. The second line is translated in the marg. 'And to judgement and plenteous justice he doeth no violence.' The verb is probably correctly rendered, but we should divide the verse into three lines and translate, '*Touching* the Almighty we cannot find him out, He is excellent in power and in judgement, And to plenteous justice he doeth no violence.' Better still probably it would be, with transposition and a change of pointing, to read with Duhm 'He is excellent in power and plenteous in justice, And to judgement he doeth no violence.' To Job's complaint Elihu replies, True, God is inscrutable, but He is not unjust. We

24 Men do therefore fear him :
He regardeth not any that are wise of heart.

38 [A] Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said,

---

cannot understand His ways, but the appearance of injustice is created by our limitations, and corrected by a proper piety.

24. Man's true attitude is therefore a reverent humility, but to the critic of His ways, wise in his own conceit, God will pay no heed. A final attack on Job, and withal a parting thrust at the poet for representing God as speaking from the storm, instead of treating Job with disdainful silence, and as approving later of his utterances concerning Him.

The friends had asserted very strongly the greatness of God and the impossibility of understanding His ways, and Elihu follows in their footsteps. But he draws for his description of atmospheric phenomena largely on the speeches of Yahweh, but also on such a passage as xxvi. 5–14.

xxxviii. Once again we are at the poet's feet, a welcome change, more than ever to be enthralled by the spell of his genius. Here, as is fitting when the Almighty is the speaker, the poet takes his highest flight. These chapters should immediately follow ch. xxxi.

xxxviii. 1–3. Yahweh, answering Job from the storm, asks who so ignorantly makes His world-plan dark, and challenges him to the contest.

xxxviii. 4–15. Where was Job when God laid the foundations of the earth, who measured it, on what did the sockets for its pillars rest, who laid its corner stone, amid the songs of the morning stars? Who shut in the sea as it burst from the womb, clad it in clouds, and fixed its bounds? Has Job given orders to the morning, to shake the wicked from the darkness that covers them, while all things stand out in sudden sharpness, like clay under the seal, and the wicked are restrained from their crimes?

xxxviii. 16–30. Has Job visited the springs that feed the sea, or the recesses of the deep, or the realm of death? Does he know all the breadth of the earth? What is the way to the home of light and darkness? No doubt Job, coeval with them, knows it well! Has he entered the storehouses of snow and hail, prepared for God's battles? What are the paths of light and wind? Who has hewn out the channel for the torrential rain and the lightning, that rain may fall where no man dwells. What father had the rain and dew, what mother had the ice and frost, which covers the streams?

Who is this that darkeneth counsel 2

---

xxxviii. 31–38. Is it Job that binds or looses the constellations, and leads them in their course? Does he know the laws which govern them, and establish their rule in the earth? Does he command the clouds and the lightning? Who has given the clouds their wisdom? Who tilts the bottles of heaven so that the rain turns the dust into clods?

xxxviii. 39—xxxix. 4. Who satisfies the hunger of lion or raven? Does Job know the wild goats' travail, when and how they bear? The young grow up swiftly and soon take care of themselves.

xxxix. 5–12. Who has given the wild ass his indomitable freedom? He dwells in the desert and scorns the city, has no driver, but seeks his food on the mountains. Will the wild ox serve Job, harrow his fields, or be trusted to bring home his harvest?

xxxix. 13–18. The ostrich leaves her eggs on the ground, forgetful that man or beast may crush them. She is cruel and careless, deprived of wisdom by God, yet she outdistances the horseman.

xxxix. 19–25. Has Job given the horse his might and quivering mane, or made him leap like a locust? Terrible is his snorting, he paws the ground, rushes undismayed to the battle, while the quiver rattles against him and the flashing weapons. He swallows the ground in his fury, and cannot be held in when he hears the trumpet, and he scents the fray from afar.

xxxix. 26–30. Is it by Job's wisdom that the hawk migrates to the south? Does the eagle soar at Job's command? She dwells on the tooth of the rock, seeking the prey with far-reaching glance, her young ones suck blood, and she is to be found by the slain.

xxxviii. **1.** There is no need to assume that the words **out of the whirlwind** were added by the author of the Elihu speeches to connect with his own description of the storm, still less are they any evidence that these speeches were the work of the poet himself. The poet needs no long-winded enumeration of the various storm phenomena, which would have weakened the force of the speech that was to follow. The simple words bring before the mind of the readers, familiar with other pictures of a theophany, the whole situation; here the thrifty speech is higher art than the most gorgeous accumulation of details. It was natural for the poet to represent Yahweh as appearing in storm, such was His manner. But he had also a special reason. Just as Job had implored God to reason with him and make clear the cause of his

By words without knowledge?
3 Gird up now thy loins like a man;
For I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.
4 Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?

---

sufferings, nay, had even expressed the confidence that He would do so, and God on the contrary, when He speaks, overwhelms him with crushing irony, so, too, he had entreated God not to appal him with the terror of His majesty, and had also risen to the conviction that He would not contend with him in the greatness of His power, but here also God disappoints him and affrights him with the storm. Yet though He speaks out of the storm, it is not with unintelligible thunder, but 'through the thunder comes a human voice.' Cf. especially the theophany to Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 11–13.

out of the whirlwind: better 'out of the storm.' The Hebrew is irregularly written; Klostermann thinks it points to the dropping of a word and suggests 'out of the roaring of the storm.'

2. The reference is to Job, as is affirmed by the previous verse and suggested by xlii. 3. But if Elihu had been the last speaker the words ought to refer to him. This would involve the inference that the poet introduced Elihu as a speaker whose contribution was not to be taken seriously—an utterly untenable view. Accordingly this evidence very strongly confirms the view derived from the contents of the Elihu speeches, that they are a later and inharmonious addition to the poem. Yahweh condemns Job for making dark the Divine plan of the world. He had spoken as though it was all a tangled riddle. Really there is in it a beautiful luminous order. It is very instructive to compare what the author of Ecclesiastes says on this point: God has ordered all things, and each falls in place in the Divine plan of the world, but man cannot see the harmonious design, to him the world presents only a perplexing reign of caprice. But this is because God has deliberately willed that man shall not be able to find out His work; He has implanted the instinct for search, but doomed it to futility. Job has expressed the view that there is no moral order, Ecclesiastes affirms that there is an order, but God has made it impenetrable to man.

3. Scornfully inviting Job to the contest he had so often demanded.

4. Now follows a series of ironical questions intended to convict Job of ignorance touching the phenomena of nature, and therefore of incompetence to criticize God's plan. The question in this verse recalls xv. 7, cf. also verse 21. The work of creation is described as the construction of a huge building.

Declare, if thou hast understanding.
Who determined the measures thereof, if thou knowest? 5
Or who stretched the line upon it?
Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened? 6
Or who laid the corner stone thereof;
When the morning stars sang together, 7
And all the sons of God shouted for joy?
Or *who* shut up the sea with doors, 8
When it brake forth, *as if* it had issued out of the womb;
When I made the cloud the garment thereof, 9

---

if thou hast understanding: *lit.* 'if thou knowest understanding.'

5. if: marg. 'seeing,' many scholars 'that.' Was he there so as to know?

6. foundations: *lit.* 'sockets.' In these sockets the pillars which support the edifice are sunk.

fastened: *lit.* 'made to sink.' The answer to the question on what they rest is here represented as something unknown to Job; according to xxvi. 7 (see note) the earth was not supported from below, but suspended from above over empty space.

7. The stone-laying of the earth was celebrated with jubilant song. So when the foundation of the second temple was laid there was music and singing, and the people shouted with a great shout (Ezra iii. 10, 11; cf. Zech. iv. 7). When the world's foundation-stone was laid the stars were the choir and the angels uttered the shout of joy. The stars are here thought of as older than the earth (contrast Gen. i. 16). According to the common Hebrew view they are regarded as animated, and closely associated with the angels. The morning stars are perhaps named because the acts celebrated were supposed to take place in the morning. Since the stars are led out of their home into the sky and then, when their work is done, return, the fact that the morning stars sing indicate that the laying of the foundation-stone took place while these stars were shining.

8. The sea is elsewhere the turbulent power that needs to be kept under control, lest it storm heaven with its tossing waves. Here it is described when first it burst from the womb of chaos; even then God repressed it with stern control.

as if **it had issued**: better as in marg., 'and issued.'

9. For the new-born child there must be a garment and a swaddling-band; these are the clouds, which seem to be wreathed

And thick darkness a swaddlingband for it,
10 And prescribed for it my decree,
And set bars and doors,
11 And said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further;
And here shall thy proud waves be stayed?
12 Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days *began*,
And caused the dayspring to know its place;
13 That it might take hold of the ends of the earth,
And the wicked be shaken out of it?
14 It is changed as clay under the seal;
And *all things* stand forth as a garment:

---

about it on the horizon, or the mists with which it is at times covered. **thick darkness** is rather 'thick cloud.'

10. prescribed: *lit.* 'brake.' The word is used rather strangely, and it is questionable if it can mean to prescribe. For **decree** the marg. renders 'boundary,' and 'brake a boundary' may refer to the indentations of the coast, or the irregular high-water mark. It would be better to read 'its boundary.' Merx makes the very attractive suggestion that we should transpose this verb, reading a passive third person, and the last verb in verse 11 (reading it as a first person). Then we should translate here 'I appointed for it my decree' and in verse 11 'And thy proud waves shall be broken.' Marshall similarly, but keeping the first person active, 'And I will break thy proud waves.' Bickell, 'Here shall thy proud waves rest.'

12. The morning must know at what exact time each day must break, and the flush of dawn must also know at what point it must irradiate the sky.

13. As the dawn takes up its position, it seizes, by the light it flashes across the earth, the coverlet of darkness, in which the wicked night-prowlers are hidden, twitches it off and shakes them out. They have to scurry under shelter from the dreaded light.

14. Just as the flat surface of the clay is suddenly changed by the impression of a seal, which leaves upon it a well-defined image, so the dull uniformity of the earth by night is all at once changed to sharp distinctness, and stands out in clear relief under the action of the light. It is not simply the perfect clearness with which the light throws up the innumerable features that go to make up the landscape, but the suddenness of its action, the seal stamps the impression on the clay all at once. Dawn is not in Palestine the slow process it is with us. The simile of the

And from the wicked their light is withholden, 15
And the high arm is broken.
Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea? 16
Or hast thou walked in the recesses of the deep?
Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee? 17
Or hast thou seen the gates of the shadow of death?
Hast thou comprehended the breadth of the earth? 18
Declare, if thou knowest it all.
Where is the way to the dwelling of light, 19
And as for darkness, where is the place thereof;

---

garment is explained by some to refer to the varied colours with which the earth is decked. The expression, however, suggests rather how the earth is clothed with its robe of verdure and trees, as a garment clings in folds to its wearer. Marg. 'as *in* a garment.'

15. their light: i. e. darkness, just as in xxiv. 17 morning is to them what midnight is to others. The arm raised to smite is broken.

It is unnecessary to let verses 19, 20 follow, on account of community of subject.

16. the springs of the sea are the fountains of the great deep. The sea has burst forth from the subterranean ocean, which still feeds it, inasmuch as in the bed of the sea there are openings connecting with the abyss beneath. When these fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven opened through which the waters of the heavenly ocean, the 'waters above the firmament,' poured down, the Deluge was the result (Gen. vii. 11). It was brought to an end by stopping the fountains of the abyss and shutting the windows in the sky (Gen. viii. 2).

recesses: marg. and A. V. 'search,' cf. xi. 7. The text rendering gives the sense.

17. Below these 'recesses' lies Sheol, the home of the dead, cf. xxvi. 5. Job knows nothing of it, but in xxvi. 6 it is said to be bare to God's gaze. For the dense gloom of Sheol see x. 21, 22. The repetition of **gates** is awkward, perhaps we should point differently with the LXX and read 'warders.' The LXX has also the variant in the second line, 'Have the warders of the shadow of death affrighted thee'? which reminds one of the representations of Cerberus.

18. From depth God passes on to breadth; if Job's researches have not extended in one direction perhaps they have in another?

19. Light is described, says Cheyne, 'as a mysterious physical

20 That thou shouldest take it to the bound thereof,
And that thou shouldest discern the paths to the house thereof?
21 *Doubtless*, thou knowest, for thou wast then born,
And the number of thy days is great!
22 Hast thou entered the treasuries of the snow,
Or hast thou seen the treasuries of the hail,
23 Which I have reserved against the time of trouble,
Against the day of battle and war?
24 By what way is the light parted,
Or the east wind scattered upon the earth?
25 Who hath cleft a channel for the waterflood,

---

essence, dwelling in a secret place.' This applies also to darkness. Cf. xxvi. 10.

20. discern: probably with Hoffmann we should read 'bring it to the paths,' pointing differently and perhaps inserting a consonant. We thus improve the parallelism.

21. Cf. verse 4, xv. 7.

22. See note on xxxvii. 9. The repetition of **treasuries** is strange. Duhm thinks that, as in verse 17, the word should be slightly corrected to give the sense of the keeper of the treasury. We read of such functionaries in Enoch, which supplies a good many parallels here. Hail frequently plays a part in descriptions of battle or judgements, e. g. Joshua x. 11; Isa. xxviii. 17, xxx. 30; Ps. xviii. 12, 13; Ezek. xiii. 13.

24. Marg. 'Which is the way *to the place where* the light is, &c.' The meaning is thought to be by what way do light and wind spread over the earth with such mysterious swiftness. The text, however, probably needs correction. The bracketing together of light and wind is strange, especially when the light has been dealt with already (verse 19). Many scholars substitute 'wind' for 'light.' A much easier emendation is Hoffmann's 'mist' (*'ēd* as in Gen. ii. 6). Duhm completes this by reading *qārīm* for *qādīm*, an infinitesimal change, 'or the fresh water scattered on the earth.' This leads up well to the next verse. We should have expected the wind to be included; still, there is no attempt at completeness, the rainbow, for example, is not mentioned.

25. the waterflood is the torrential rain, which is supposed to pour from the upper ocean down a 'channel' specially cleft for it by God through the vault of the sky. So the lightning has a

Or a way for the lightning of the thunder ;
To cause it to rain on a land where no man is ; 26
On the wilderness, wherein there is no man ;
To satisfy the waste and desolate *ground* ; 27
And to cause the tender grass to spring forth ?
Hath the rain a father ? 28
Or who hath begotten the drops of dew ?
Out of whose womb came the ice ? 29
And the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it ?
The waters are hidden as *with* stone, 30
And the face of the deep is frozen.

---

track along which it has to shoot. The second line has been repeated by the author of xxviii. 26.

26, 27. Very important for the poet's attitude to the problem. The fault of Job is that he is self-centred. The world is cruel, immorally governed, because he suffers. He widens his view and brings, as a further indictment against God, the misery of mankind. Beyond that he does not look. But God's concerns embrace far more than man. Otherwise why slake the arid desert's thirst, or cause the fresh herbage to spring forth there, where no man's need can ever be satisfied by it, where no man's eye will ever rest upon it ? It is not merely Job's ignorance of things that he could not know, it is his narrow outlook, that makes him oblivious of much that is plain, for which Yahweh rebukes him.

tender grass : marg. 'greensward.' The literal rendering is 'And to cause the place of tender grass to sprout forth.' We should, with G. H. B. Wright, transpose two consonants (reading *tsāmē* 'thirsty land' for *mōtsā'* 'place') and render 'And to cause the thirsty land to bring forth tender grass.'

28. Struck out by Bickell and Duhm as a variant of verse 29, and intolerable after so much has been said about the rain. Still, the dew is nowhere else mentioned.

29. gendered it : if verse 28 is omitted, this is the more natural translation. If, however, it be retained, the marg. 'given it birth' is preferable, verse 28 speaking of the father, verse 29 of the mother.

30. Frost is more marvellous to an Oriental than to ourselves. The reader of *The Talisman* will remember how the hero seeks to convince his apparently incredulous hearer of the possibility of such a phenomenon. The marg. renders 'are congealed like

31 Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades,
Or loose the bands of Orion?
32 Canst thou lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season?
Or canst thou guide the Bear with her train?

---

stone,' and several take this view, which, however, imposes a dubious meaning on the word. The rendering in the text gives no satisfactory sense; the waters can hardly be said to hide themselves by becoming like stone, that is, by transformation into ice. It is probably best, with Merx and some other scholars, to transpose the verbs and read 'The waters are frozen like stone, and the face of the deep is hidden.' The face of the deep is the surface of the water that flows under the ice.

31. Canst gives a wrong suggestion, render 'dost'; is it Job who binds or loosens? For **cluster** the marg. gives 'chain,' and as a further alternative 'sweet influences. The latter is the A. V. rendering, and may be safely set aside on philological grounds. If we accept the rendering **Pleiades** either 'cluster' or 'chain' gives a good sense, the former referring to the binding of the stars into a cluster, the latter apparently to the binding of the stars so that their freedom of movement is limited. Possibly, however, Canis Major is meant, and in that case the reference is to the chain by which the dog of Orion is held in leash. In favour of the identification with Orion's dog is the mention of Orion himself in the next line (if that identification is correct). What is meant by the bands of Orion is not clear. Burney explains it of bonds in which he is thought to have been chained by the Deity: 'If man can loose these bands—the poet seems to mean—he may then hope to gain control over those changes in the season which the constellation marks' (*EBi.* col. 4782). But this implies the translation 'canst' instead of 'dost.' It is implied that God does loose the bands of Orion. The meaning is not clear. Orion seems to have been one of the giants, who for rebellion against God was lashed by Him to the sky. Perhaps the thought is that in spite of his turbulent character the Almighty relaxes his bands, because, however dangerous he may be, God can, when He will, contemptuously leave him at large. Job, if he could, would not dare to do this.

32. Mazzaroth: the sense is unknown. Some think of 'the signs of the Zodiac (so marg.). But while the word itself is plural, it is referred to as a singular (**in their season** is *lit.* 'in its season'). It is therefore probably a constellation, but whether the Hyades or some other may be left undetermined. Several views may be seen in Dillmann or Marshall.

train: Heb. 'sons,' the stars corresponding to what we should call the horses in Charles's Wain. But we might with

Knowest thou the ordinances of the heavens?
Canst thou establish the dominion thereof in the earth? 33
Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds,
That abundance of waters may cover thee? 34
Canst thou send forth lightnings, that they may go,
And say unto thee, Here we are? 35
Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? 36
Or who hath given understanding to the mind?
Who can number the clouds by wisdom? 37

Merx point differently and translate 'Dost thou comfort the Bear over her sons.' There would be a reference to some myth of the Bear having lost her children, otherwise unknown to us. See note on ix. 9 for the identification.

33. the ordinances of the heavens seem to mean the laws which guide the movements of the heavenly bodies. Cheyne reads 'the pictures of heaven,' i.e. the signs of the Zodiac (*EBi.* col. 2989). We might point the verb as a Piel (as in verse 12), 'Dost thou make the heavens to know the laws?' i.e. do you lay down the laws which the heavens must obey? This is confirmed by the parallelism, and the following verse. The second line refers to the dominion exercised by the heavenly bodies over the affairs of earth (cf. Gen. i. 14–18).

34. The second line occurs also in xxii. 11. The sense is not very good; perhaps we should read with the LXX 'that abundance of water may answer thee.' The present text may very well have been altered under the influence of xxii. 11.

36. It is clear that **inward parts** and **mind** are wholly out of place in this context, and that some meteorological phenomena must be referred to. What these are is very uncertain, since the second term occurs nowhere else, and the first may or may not be the same word that we find in Ps. li. 6 (there also translated 'inward parts'). If it is, the idea in both cases is probably that of darkness. Hence here we should translate, as in marg., 'dark clouds,' a view taken by many scholars. Duhm translates 'feathery clouds.' For 'mind' the marg. gives 'meteor.' Others think of the various cloud-formations; we might perhaps translate 'cloud-rack' in that case; others again of the comet, or the Aurora Borealis. In any case they possess wisdom, either in the sense that men can draw auguries from them, or that they prognosticate the weather.

37. The reference to the numbering of the clouds is rather unexpected, and the explanation that so the right number is

Or who can pour out the bottles of heaven,
38 When the dust runneth into a mass,
And the clods cleave fast together?
39 Wilt thou hunt the prey for the lioness?
Or satisfy the appetite of the young lions,
40 When they couch in their dens,
And abide in the covert to lie in wait?
41 Who provideth for the raven his food,
When his young ones cry unto God,
And wander for lack of meat?

---

always employed for the purpose somewhat artificial. G. H. B. Wright reads 'breaks'; Duhm's emendation 'spreads out' would be better (*yiphrōs*).

pour out: *lit.* 'cause to lie down.' The clouds are thought of as skins full of water (xxvi. 8); as they are tilted the water streams out in the form of rain.

38. It is not clear whether the meaning is that the rain thus descends when through drought the clods are baked hard, or whether that as a consequence of the rain the soil, turned to powder by the heat, is transformed into clods. The latter is probably to be preferred.

39. The poet now passes to the second great division of the speech, and rapidly sketches a series of inimitable pictures from the animal creation. A new chapter should have begun here.

First of all God names the lion. Is it Job who scours the country to beat up its prey, while it remains inactive in its den, or waits in the thicket till the prey passes so close that it may pounce on it? Far from it; he would sooner slay the robber of the herd than drive its prey into its clutches. Yet the lion, as well as man, is the object of God's loving care, and the needful food is provided for it. Perhaps it is the lioness that remains in the den with the cubs, and the young lions that lurk in the covert till God brings the prey in reach of their spring. Cf. Ps. civ. 20–22.

41. The raven might have been expected in connexion with the hawk and the eagle, rather than interpolated among the quadrupeds. Yet the contrast between the king of the forest and these lowly fowl of the air, both alike cared for by God, is very effective. Cf. Ps. cxlvii. 9; Luke xii. 24. G. H. B. Wright, however, points the word translated **raven** so as to mean 'evening': 'Who provideth at evening its food?' In that case it is still the lion that is referred to. Duhm accepts this, but inserts a line

Knowest thou the time when the wild goats of the rock 39
bring forth?
Or canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?
Canst thou number the months that they fulfil? 2
Or knowest thou the time when they bring forth?
They bow themselves, they bring forth their young, 3
They cast out their sorrows.
Their young ones are in good liking, they grow up in the 4
open field;
They go forth, and return not again.
Who hath sent out the wild ass free? 5

---

before the third to complete the parallelism, 'When the young lions roar after prey' (from Ps. civ. 21), and in the fourth line reads with the LXX 'to seek for meat.'

xxxix. **1.** The word translated **wild goats** is masculine; if the text is right, we must suppose that the form is used as a feminine. Duhm very cleverly emends the text 'Dost thou teach the wild goats of the rock heat?' The word occurs only Deut. vii. 13, and is of dubious sense. On this the next line follows naturally, only it would be better to translate 'Dost thou watch over the calving of the hinds?' The present text is not likely to be right, since it is substantially repeated in the next verse. Bickell, followed by Budde, omits the word translated **the time when** as incorrect dittography of the last two letters of the preceding word, 'Dost thou know the bringing forth of the wild goats.' This mitigates the difficulties.

2. Perhaps we should render 'Dost thou number the months they should fulfil? Or dost thou prescribe the time when they should bring forth?' It is not simply Job's ignorance of these inaccessible creatures, but the fact that he does not appoint their course of life. God knows, but He also exercises an active control. No single detail in the lot of the lowliest member of the vast universe escapes His immediate care. The lesson of the Sermon on the Mount also; but Jesus adds 'ye are of more value than many sparrows.'

3. The ease of their parturition; they are soon delivered and rid of their birth-pangs.

4. return not again: better as in marg. 'return not unto them,' i. e. they rapidly become independent of the parents' help; God so prospers their growth.

5–8. The wild ass is the supreme example of a creature

Or who hath loosed the bands of the wild ass?
6 Whose house I have made the wilderness,
And the salt land his dwelling place.
7 He scorneth the tumult of the city,
Neither heareth he the shoutings of the driver.
8 The range of the mountains is his pasture,
And he searcheth after every green thing.
9 Will the wild-ox be content to serve thee?
Or will he abide by thy crib?
10 Canst thou bind the wild-ox with his band in the furrow?
Or will he harrow the valleys after thee?
11 Wilt thou trust him, because his strength is great?
Or wilt thou leave to him thy labour?

---

inspired with a passionate love of liberty, all the more so in contrast to its drudge of a brother. Civilization it loathes, and will not be robbed of the wild free life of the desert. The poet's sympathy throbs in his scorn and enthusiasm. The land 'where no man is' (xxxviii. 26), there is the ideal home, far from the fret and throng of the city, free from the tyranny of its conventions. No cramped city hovel, but the wide wilderness for a home, no driver to urge him with curses to his work, the wild ass lives his own life, finding exhilarating exercise for his powers in fleet scouring of the mountain ranges for its food. To the world-weary poet how enviable a life!

The Hebrew has different words for **wild ass** in verse 5; the second is the Aramaic term.

6. The steppe and the salt land are the extreme opposite of the fruitful lands. The wild ass contrives to live there, and must, if he would be free from men. Salt is a welcome ingredient in its diet.

7. driver: marg. 'taskmaster.'

9. The identification of the wild-ox is a matter of much dispute, which fortunately is of little moment for the appreciation of the poem. It must have resembled the tame ox in appearance to point the contrast, and it must have been incapable of domestication. The margin refers to Num. xxiii. 22, where the margin gives 'ox-antelope.'

10. It would be better to eliminate **the wild-ox** as mistaken repetition from verse 9 and read 'Wilt thou bind him with his furrow rope?'

Wilt thou confide in him, that he will bring home thy seed, 12
And gather *the corn of* thy threshing-floor?
The wing of the ostrich rejoiceth; 13

---

13. The whole description of the ostrich, verses 13–18, is absent in the LXX, and omitted by Hatch, Bickell, Duhm, and Beer. Even Dillmann admits that it is perhaps an interpolation. Its presence among descriptions of quadrupeds, the awkwardness in a speech of God of the reference to God in the third person, especially the absence of the interrogative form of address, are the reasons urged against it. These are weighty, but not decisive. Absence in the LXX may be due to difficulty of translation or objection to the contents of the passage. The interrogative form is sometimes abandoned after the introduction to the descriptions (e. g. verses 3, 4; 6–8; 21–25; 28–30). The difficulty of its complete absence here is real, but this mitigates it somewhat. For the reference to God in the third person cf. xl. 9; still, verse 17 might at need be omitted. The omission of the whole passage would be a distinct loss to the speech. But it is quite possible that originally it stood in connexion with the other descriptions of birds, either after that of the hawk or that of the eagle. The transference to its present position before the passage on the horse is readily accounted for by the mention of the horse in the last line (verse 18).

The word for **ostrich** occurs nowhere else, possibly a more usual word should be read; there is no question that the ostrich is meant. The word translated **rejoiceth** is not found elsewhere in this conjugation. It is thought to mean 'beats proudly' or 'joyously.' The word is not very appropriate in the case of the ostrich, and has no special fitness in the context. Duhm reads 'is perverse' (*n*^{e}*lōzāh*), which gives a fair parallel with the next line. G. H. B. Wright emends the second line very ingeniously, getting the sense 'Does the wing of the ostrich soar aloft, Or is it strong on the wing like the stork and the falcon?' He places the passage after verse 30, and thus secures a contrast with the eagle placing its nest high on the rock. The ostrich cannot soar aloft, but must leave its eggs on the ground. Ley, with slight emendations (*niqlāsā* and *ḥasira*), renders 'The wing of the ostrich is mocked; Are its pinions and feathers too short?' In that case the point lies in the incongruity between the huge size of the ostrich and the ludicrous shortness of its wings. With wings so short it cannot hatch its eggs like other birds, yet in spite of this it moves so swiftly in flight that it mocks its swiftest pursuers. There is a fine contrast between the mockery to which the ostrich is exposed and the mockery with which she baffles her

But are her pinions and feathers kindly?
14 For she leaveth her eggs on the earth,
And warmeth them in the dust,
15 And forgetteth that the foot may crush them,
Or that the wild beast may trample them.
16 She is hardened against her young ones, as if they were not hers:
Though her labour be in vain, *she is* without fear;

---

pursuers, all the more that the despised wings help her to turn the tables on the scoffers. The chief objection to this is perhaps that it seems to require the omission of verse 17, for the neglect of her eggs is due not to a divinely ordered stupidity, but to inability to hatch them. Still, verse 17 is objectionable on account of the reference to God in the third person. The passage in its present form does not hang well together, for verse 18 stands in no intimate connexion with what has gone before, but simply mentions another characteristic. That the ostrich out-distances the horseman should, however, be a surprising testimony to creative wisdom, and this we get if the contrast be between the tiny wings and the speed of her flight. To fly so swiftly with wings so short—the efficiency of the inadequate is a marvel of Divine skill. The proverbial unkindness of the ostrich to its young (see next note) may have led to the misreading of the original text.

kindly: cf. Lam. iv. 3, where the people under stress of famine, worse even than the jackals that do at least suckle their young, 'is become cruel like the ostriches in the wilderness.' The word is used for the stork, on account of its kindness to its young. Hence the marg. '*like* the stork's.' While the margin does not give the probable translation, yet if the text is right the word is probably chosen to suggest a contrast with the stork.

14. The ostrich lays all her eggs before 'sitting,' and often leaves them unprotected even after she has begun to brood, but towards the end of the period does not leave the nest at all. Other eggs are laid outside the nest, these are not hatched, but form food for the young. It was commonly believed that she did not brood at all, and probably this belief was shared by the poet.

15. Really the shells are very hard, so that there is little danger of their being crushed.

16. The marg. renders 'She dealeth hardly with.' The term **young ones** is used proleptically. It is the eggs, strictly speaking, that she abandons. The second line is not clear. The

Because God hath deprived her of wisdom, 17
Neither hath he imparted to her understanding.
What time she lifteth up herself on high, 18
She scorneth the horse and his rider.
Hast thou given the horse *his* might? 19
Hast thou clothed his neck with the quivering mane?

---

meaning is apparently that it gives her no concern if her labour of laying the eggs should all prove in vain. Dillmann explains this by the fact that the ostrich will often destroy the eggs herself if she sees man or beast near them. Others explain that she apprehends no danger, and therefore abandons her eggs to their fate; they may get hatched, but they may fail, in which case her labour has all been in vain.

17. The stupidity of the ostrich is as proverbial in the East as her cruelty. If the verse is genuine, it must account not for her laying the eggs on the ground, but for leaving them to the risks of her absence.

18. Dillmann thinks the point is, that the ostrich has another wonderful quality, though it is a bird, it does not fly, but runs like a quadruped, and is, indeed, swifter than the horse. This makes the main point to be something not mentioned at all. The quality made prominent is the swiftness of movement. This forms no good contrast to the preceding context, for few will see in her swiftness the strange contradiction to her cruelty and foolishness which Davidson discerns. Swiftness and cruelty are often associated, e. g. 'Their horses also are swifter than leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves' (Hab. i. 8), and why should speed and stupidity be incongruous qualities? More probably, as already pointed out (see note on verse 13), the contradiction lies in the shortness of wing and the swiftness of pace. The words **on high** naturally suggest flight, but since the ostrich does not fly, but runs, though accelerating her speed with tail and wings, some think the text should be corrected. Wright, followed by Budde, reads 'When the archers come,' which involves little alteration. The text, however, gives a fairly good sense. She strains aloft, though actually she does not rise from the ground.

19. the quivering mane: so most scholars. The word does not occur elsewhere, the marg. says 'Heb. shaking.' Some think that it is the whole quivering of the neck in the excitement of battle that is meant. The A. V. followed several versions in rendering 'Hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?' It was unlucky for Carlyle that the A. V. betrayed him into selecting this magnificent nonsense to illustrate the poet's truthfulness of

20 Hast thou made him to leap as a locust?
The glory of his snorting is terrible.
21 He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength:
He goeth out to meet the armed men.
22 He mocketh at fear, and is not dismayed;
Neither turneth he back from the sword.
23 The quiver rattleth against him,
The flashing spear and the javelin.
24 He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage;
Neither believeth he that it is the voice of the trumpet.
25 As oft as the trumpet *soundeth* he saith, Aha!
And he smelleth the battle afar off,
The thunder of the captains, and the shouting.
26 Doth the hawk soar by thy wisdom,
And stretch her wings toward the south?
27 Doth the eagle mount up at thy command,

---

observation. The phrase is splendid but unmeaning. Carlyle's dictum was as just as his illustration was unfortunate.

20. Cf. Joel ii. 4; Rev. ix. 7, where the comparison is reversed.

21. Heb. 'they paw,' but the singular should probably be read. Perhaps we should connect **in his strength** with **He goeth out.**

the armed men: marg. 'the weapons,' which is more literal.

23. against: much better as in marg. 'upon.'

24. The second line seems to mean that it is too good to be true. But scholars generally prefer the marg. 'Neither standeth he still at the sound of the trumpet,' but it is not clear whether the meaning is when the trumpet sounds a halt or a retreat, or when it sounds the advance.

25. smelleth the battle, as we speak of scenting the fray. The verb does not suit the next line; the text may be incomplete, but prosaic precision is not to be expected, and the verse is highly effective as it stands.

26. Did Job implant in the hawk the migratory instinct, that prompts it, as winter is coming on, to leave for a warmer climate? Cf. Jer. viii. 7. We might translate, 'to the south wind,' in which case the reference would not be to the presage of winter, but to the strength of wing that enabled it to fly in the teeth of the south wind.

27. It is rather strange that only a couplet should be devoted

And make her nest on high?
She dwelleth on the rock, and hath her lodging *there*, 28
Upon the crag of the rock, and the strong hold.
From thence she spieth out the prey; 29
Her eyes behold it afar off.
Her young ones also suck up blood: 30
And where the slain are, there is she.

[M] Moreover the LORD answered Job, and said, 40

---

to the hawk. It would be hazardous, however, to infer with Bickell and Duhm that verses 27–30 also belong to the description of the hawk, and that we should eliminate the mounting up of the eagle, reading simply 'Doth she at thy command make her nest on high?' As the lion opens the series, it is fitting that the eagle should close it. The second line is short and bald in the Hebrew, perhaps with Budde we might read 'And make her nest high on the mountains.'

30. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 28.

xl. 1—xlii. 6. This passage opens with a brief challenge to Job, driving home the lesson of the preceding speech. Job replies that he is too insignificant, and will no longer contend with God. Then follows a second speech of Yahweh, to which Job replies in penitence and self-loathing. Not all of this second speech can be the composition of the poet. Most scholars are agreed that the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan, xl. 15—xli. 34, are a later addition. They are unsuitable in their present connexion. The main point dealt with here is Job's denial of the Divine righteousness and attempt to substantiate his own, and to this the lengthy description of these monsters seems irrelevant. It might, indeed, be said that Job is also asked whether he has might like God, and is challenged to clothe himself with majesty and subdue the evils of the world. From this point of view these sections might seem to be in place, for if Job cannot tame two of God's creatures, how can he match himself with God, or how undertake the moral government of the universe, which would require him to cope successfully with the forces of evil? But God's might and Job's weakness is a subordinate thought; the main point attacked is Job's criticism of God's righteousness, and the passages in dispute divert attention from this to a secondary issue. Moreover, while the main theme occupies but a few verses, these descriptions fill forty-four verses; thus all sense of proportion is lost. Secondly, inasmuch as they describe animals, their place would have been

2 [A] Shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty?

with the animal pictures in xxxviii. 39—xxxix. 30. But they would be quite out of place there. There the sections devoted to each animal are quite short, here behemoth has ten verses, while leviathan has no less than thirty-four. And the difference in length is not so striking as the difference in form. Here the descriptions are heavy and laboured, gaining their effect, such as it is, by an accumulation of details, a catalogue of their points and minute descriptions of the various parts of their bodies. But the poet who gave us the pictures of the wild ass, the horse, and the eagle was a swift impressionist, springing imagination with a touch, not stifling it with the fullness of detail proper to a natural historian. The interrogative form, which for the most part is found in these earlier pictures, is here for the most part absent. Thirdly, it is generally agreed that the execution is less artistic and the style inferior. It ought, however, to be said that so accomplished a stylist as Renan expressed a more favourable judgement. He says the style is that of the best parts of the poem, and everything indicates that the section came from the writer of the rest of the speeches of Yahweh, though not written at the same time. The truth is that the style is unequal. Some scholars (e. g. Budde) mitigate the objection by striking out xli. 12-34 as a later addition. This is based on the correct observation that these verses are the weakest part of this section from a literary point of view, xli. 12 especially being intolerably out of place in a speech of Yahweh, though the text is probably corrupt. What is then left of the description of leviathan, xli. 1–11, is much nearer to the other animal passages, and like them is thrown into the form of questions. Still, it is appreciably longer, though this objection would be almost entirely removed if xli. 9–11 did not properly form part of it. But the description of behemoth, while not incredibly long, remains open to the two objections that the enumeration of parts of the body is prominent, and that the interrogative form of address is entirely absent. No insuperable objection could have been taken to xli. 1–11 (or 1–8), if it had been associated with the other animal pictures. But since the reasons given suffice to prove that the rest of the description of leviathan and the whole passage about behemoth are later additions, we should probably accept the same conclusion as to xli. 1–11, on the grounds that behemoth and leviathan can hardly be separated, and that it is found in its present context, and not in ch. xxxix. It is, no doubt, difficult, as Cornill urges, to think that the second speech of Yahweh consisted simply of xl. 7–14. Yet the utmost that could be inferred from this would be that the speech was originally longer, not that the behemoth and leviathan sections must have formed part of it. Yet even this is

He that argueth with God, let him answer it.

not at all necessary. By so short a speech the poet may have intended to show that Job now needed but little to bring him fully to the state of mind which Yahweh desired to produce. It is, however, also possible that, with the intrusion of these sections, the original order has been in other respects disturbed. It is a little surprising that we have a double confession by Job. Possibly xl. 3-5 was originally connected with xlii. 2-6. In that case it would not be unlikely that what has been regarded as a second speech of Yahweh ought to be regarded as the conclusion of the first. The introductory formulae, xl. 1, 6, would then be later insertions, and the same judgement would have to be passed on xl. 7, which is borrowed from xxxviii. 3. The original conclusion would then consist of xl. 2, 8-14, while Job's reply with its introductory formula would consist of xl. 3-5, xlii. 2-6 (see further note on xl. 4). This, while probable, is nevertheless less certain than the fact that the behemoth and leviathan passages formed no part of the poet's work. They were added subsequently by a writer who thought the omnipotence of Yahweh could be more successfully illustrated by these monsters than by the examples which the poet had chosen. This writer, while much inferior to the poet, was considerably superior in literary gift to the author of the Elihu speeches.

xl. 1, 2, 6-14. Will Job contend with God? then let him answer God's questions. Will he make good his own case by imputing unrighteousness to God? Is he as powerful as God? If so let him deck himself with Divine majesty and crush the proud. Then God will confess that his right hand can save him.

xl. 15-24, xli. 9-12. Let Job consider behemoth, a creature of God like himself, mighty in strength, first of God's ways, ruler of his fellows, depasturing the mountains, sleeping under the lotus, undismayed at the violence of the torrent, who can successfully assail him? Vain is the hope of subduing him, none can stand before him, or assail him and be safe.

xli. 1-8, 13-34. Can leviathan be caught and led by a rope? Would he entreat favour, or purchase his life by bondage? Could one make a pet or plaything of him? Would the merchants bargain over him? Can he be harpooned? Let him that would attempt this bethink himself in time, he would have no chance of repeating his experiment. Could any strip off his cover, or open the mouth, whose teeth are terrible. His back is all scales, inseparably fitted together. The spray from his nostrils is like a stream of light, his eyes luminous as the dawn, his breath is a fire. His neck is strong, he strikes terror wherever he goes. His flesh and heart are firm and hard. All attacks on him are futile, he mocks at all weapons.

3 Then Job answered the LORD, and said,
4 Behold, I am of small account; what shall I answer thee?
I lay mine hand upon my mouth.
5 Once have I spoken, and I will not answer;
Yea twice, but I will proceed no further.

His scales beneath are sharp as potsherds, his track in the mire like that of a threshing sledge. He beats the sea into foam. He has not his peer on earth, fearless and dreaded by the strongest, the king of all beasts.

xl. 3-5, xlii. 1-6. Job confesses his insignificance, and will speak no more. God, he knows, can do all things; he has spoken presumptuously of things he did not comprehend. He had heard of God by report only, now he beholds Him, so in self-abhorrence he repents in dust and ashes.

2. Will God's critic still contend with Him? He has no right to do it unless he can answer the questions God has propounded.

4. This follows well on verse 2. Feeling his own insignificance in the presence of God and all the wonders of His universe, Job cannot any longer contend with God. If the present arrangement of verses is right there is force in Marshall's view that what we have here is nothing more than 'a mere dogged submission to authority.' Hence the necessity of a second Divine speech to bring him to the right temper of mind. It is, however, difficult to accept, since the second speech seems no better adapted than the first to produce the desired result; moreover, what really brings Job back to God in penitence and humility is not so much what God says to him in the first or second speech as the vision of God Himself. Accordingly we should probably see here the same temper expressed as in xlii. 2-6. Only in that case a speech of Yahweh in the tone of xl. 7-14 is not quite what we should have expected. When Job has confessed his error, such rebuke comes perilously near nagging. Hence we may very plausibly infer that verses 2, 8-14 should immediately follow xxxix. 30, and that the single speech of Yahweh was followed by a single speech from Job consisting of xl. 4, 5, xlii. 2-6 (see introduction to this section). For Job's 'I am of small account' one might compare the very striking experience under an imperfectly given anaesthetic, in James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 'And yet, on waking, my first feeling was, and it came with tears, "*Domine non sum digna*," for I had been lifted into a position for which I was too small' (p. 392).

5. answer: many correct the text slightly and read 'I will do so no more.'

[M] Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, 6

Gird up thy loins now like a man: 7
I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.
[A] Wilt thou even disannul my judgement? 8
Wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be justified?
Or hast thou an arm like God? 9
And canst thou thunder with a voice like him?
Deck thyself now with excellency and dignity; 10
And array thyself with honour and majesty.
Pour forth the overflowings of thine anger: 11
And look upon every one that is proud, and abase him.

6, 7. Probably inserted when verses 2, 8–14 were detached from their original position, and with the addition of xl. 15—xli. 34 transformed into a second Divine speech. Verse 7 is repeated from xxxviii. 3.

8. Probably stood originally closely in connexion with verse 2.

disannul my judgement: the words mean, discredit my righteousness. Job felt that either God or he must be unrighteous; since he was conscious that it was not himself, it must be God.

9–13. Job has challenged God's righteousness. This righteousness should find its sphere in the control of the universe; Job has failed to find it there. But who is he to pose as God's critic? Could he take God's place? For that he would need strength to crush the proud and the wicked. For such a task he is incompetent; but if he cannot do God's work, what right has he to say God does not do it well? He is a critic from the outside, he needs a knowledge of the conditions, such as can be gained only through actual experience of the task God has to accomplish. From such a knowledge his human frailty for ever excludes him, let him recognize the true inference, that he can never have the right to impugn God's action. It is often explained that the thought in these verses is that the supreme ruler must be righteous since the function assigned to Him is to abase the proud and trample down the wicked. This does not necessarily follow. It is what the rule of the world meant to Job; were he the ruler, so he would act. The invitation is accommodated to his point of view. The question whether He is Himself righteous in His government God does not condescend to discuss. The point He makes against Job is simply that it is foolish for him to find fault

12 Look on every one that is proud, *and* bring him low;
And tread down the wicked where they stand.
13 Hide them in the dust together;
Bind their faces in the hidden *place*.
14 Then will I also confess of thee
That thine own right hand can save thee.

---

with the course of the world, unless he is competent to play Providence himself.

12. The first line is almost the same as the second line of verse 11. Such repetition is unlikely, here especially; the existence of the variants, **abase him** and **bring him low**, probably led to the rest of the line being repeated with the second variant.

13. the hidden *place*: apparently Sheol.

14. The turn of phrase is unexpected. We should rather anticipate that God would then confess that Job was worthy to take His place. This, however, is not at all what God says, but rather that Job's right hand could save him. It is, no doubt, true that we often read of Yahweh's arm as saving Him (Isa. lix. 16, lxiii. 5; Ps. xcviii. 1) or His people (Ps. xliv. 3). But it would be a wholly unjustified inference that, when applied to a man, it attributed Divine power to him. The precise significance is hard to understand. Is God thinking of Job's many proud boasts of innocence, culminating in the splendidly bold utterance with which his great self-vindication had drawn to its close? If you would abase the proud, you must begin at home, then when you had subdued your own arrogance, I could praise you as able to save yourself. This self-salvation might be scornful irony, for the measure Job would mete out to the proud was no salvation, but a trampling into Sheol (verse 13). Were he the inexorably just judge, he must condemn himself. It might be seriously meant, however, first you would judge and subdue your pride, then you would justly deliver yourself from evil. Or is God contrasting the clean sweep Job would soon make of wickedness if he had the power, with the long indulgence which He Himself extended to it? The meddlesome reformer may mar by his haste what he seeks to mend; God praises him sarcastically, his right hand can save him, but can it save the world? (contrast Mark xv. 31). If this is the meaning, an answer is suggested to the question why God does not sweep evil away. It is not that God is more tolerant of it than man. But His hate of it makes Him seem the more tolerant, for He knows that premature triumph would be defeat. Because He is so relentless, He is content to be slow (cf. the parable of the tares). The lesson to Job is that God's

[L] Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee ; 15
He eateth grass as an ox.

---

apparent connivance at wrong may imply a more not a less deadly hostility to it. Besides, the execution of judgement might be postponed to give the sinner time to repent. Unhappily the language is so indefinite that we can feel no confidence as to its meaning. Here the speech of Yahweh comes to an end, and Job confesses his insignificance (verses 2, 3), and his presumption in speaking of things far beyond him, which, now that hearsay knowledge of God had been replaced by direct vision of Him, he repents in dust and ashes (xlii. 2–6).

xl. 15–xli. 34. Reasons have been given in the introduction to this section for the belief that this passage is an insertion by another hand. The identification of these two monsters given in the margin, of behemoth with the hippopotamus and leviathan with the crocodile, is that universally accepted by those who regard them as belonging to natural history, not to mythology. The latter view is very ancient, but it has been revived and defended by some modern scholars with great learning and skill. Cheyne in his *Job and Solomon* led the way, and was followed by Toy in his *Judaism and Christianity*. Independently, Gunkel devoted a much fuller discussion to the problem, identifying leviathan with the chaos-monster Tiamat, and behemoth with Kingu, her consort. He is followed by Zimmern, in the last edition of Schrader's *KAT*. It is true that in some passages this identification holds good. It is also true that certain details do not well fit the hippopotamus and the crocodile. Scholars generally have not accepted the mythological interpretation, but abide by the usual identification. The inappropriateness of some details may be readily explained by the imperfect knowledge or exaggeration of the author, while the detailed description, so close to the animals named, creates an almost irresistible impression that these were intended. The English reader should consult Cheyne's article 'Behemoth and Leviathan' in the *EBi.* for a statement and defence of the mythological interpretation. Those who can read German should see Budde's elaborate note on the other side.

15. behemoth has been usually regarded as a Hebraized form of *p-ehe-mou* the Egyptian term for 'water-ox.' W. M. Müller, the Egyptologist, has, however, recently affirmed that there is no philological basis for this view (*EBi.* col. 519). The word is an intensive plural of the common Hebrew word for 'beast,' and simply means a huge beast.

which I made: omitted by LXX and some modern scholars, but then the statement would be made that behemoth lived in Job's

16 Lo now, his strength is in his loins,
And his force is in the muscles of his belly.
17 He moveth his tail like a cedar:
The sinews of his thighs are knit together.
18 His bones are *as* tubes of brass;
His limbs are like bars of iron.
19 He is the chief of the ways of God:
He *only* that made him can make his sword to approach
unto him.
20 Surely the mountains bring him forth food;
Where all the beasts of the field do play.

---

neighbourhood; the text is better, and means that Job and it are alike God's creatures.

17. The comparison of the short tail to a cedar is a remarkable exaggeration. It is the only one in the enumeration of the 'points' of the hippopotamus.

18. limbs: marg. 'ribs.'

19. chief of the ways of God: this rendering suggests that he is God's masterpiece. More probably we should render 'the beginning of the ways of God.' This does not rest on a mythical story in which this place was assigned to it, but on Gen. i. 24, where, in the enumeration of the living creatures brought forth by the earth, we have cattle (*bᵉhēmāh*) placed first. The later Jewish theology spun a great deal out of this line.

The second line is generally acknowledged to be corrupt. The R. V. translation gives a poor sense awkwardly expressed. The marg., 'He that made him hath furnished *him with* his sword,' gives a sense which seems satisfactory, the sword being the tusks, with which he cuts his food. This forms a good preparation for verse 20. But the Hebrew for 'He that made him' is strange, and the interpretation of sword' rather forced. Ley reads 'his prey' (*tarpō*) for 'his sword.' This leaves the first difficulty where it was, and while it leads on to verse 20, the question is whether we ought not rather to secure a parallel to the first line. Giesebrecht has probably suggested the right solution. The precise restoration may remain uncertain, the sense was apparently that behemoth was made to be ruler of his fellows.

20. For **mountains** some read 'rivers,' we might then translate with Wright 'For the river growth provides for him.' But the hippopotamus pastures when necessary on higher lands. In Ps. l. 10 we read of the 'cattle (*bᵉhemōth*) on a thousand hills';

He lieth under the lotus trees, 21
In the covert of the reed, and the fen.
The lotus trees cover him with their shadow; 22
The willows of the brook compass him about.
Behold, if a river overflow, he trembleth not: 23
He is confident, though Jordan swell even to his mouth.
Shall any take him when he is on the watch, 24
Or pierce through his nose with a snare?

Rabbinical exegesis deduced that behemoth depastured a thousand hills. The second line gives an excellent sense, to which it is hypercritical to object. The mighty behemoth lives on grass, hence the other animals may sport in his presence without fear. We could, however, with Duhm divide a little differently, and read 'All the beasts of the field he crushes. And there he lieth, &c.'

22. Bickell omits as mere repetition of verse 21. Duhm thinks the lotus-trees could not have been mentioned again; but the present text is approved by a rather pretty double assonance. Verse 21 could better be spared, or, if emendation is necessary to keep both, the verses could be transposed and verse 21 emended. But no alteration is needed.

23 overflow: marg. 'be violent.' He is quite indifferent to the wildest fury of the torrent.

Jordan. The hippopotamus is not found in the Jordan, we must therefore translate 'a Jordan,' the term illustrating the rushing flood, named in the preceding line. Ley and Budde strike out the word. The relative size of Jordan and Nile is no real argument for this, were that in view the reference to the Nile as a Jordan would, of course, be depreciatory; the point, however, is the violence and speed of the stream.

24. when he is on the watch is literally 'in his eyes.' The R. V. may give the correct sense. Still, the parallelism of 'eyes' and 'nose' suggests that both are mentioned as objects of attack. Ley thinks the reference is to the ease with which the animal is captured by blinding its eyes. But the contrast between the colossal size and the ease of capture, which he discovers, is pretty certainly not here. There is no intention to make behemoth ridiculous, a milk and water monster; he is a companion, not a foil, to leviathan. We should insert 'Who' at the beginning of the verse (*mī hu*' has fallen out after *pīhū*). The meaning of the verse is, who will be so bold as to attack behemoth in the eyes or pierce his nose with a snare? The emendation of 'teeth' for 'eyes,' 'who will take him by his teeth?' is unnecessary. The Egyptians used to

41 Canst thou draw out leviathan with a fish hook?
Or press down his tongue with a cord?
2 Canst thou put a rope into his nose?
Or pierce his jaw through with a hook?
3 Will he make many supplications unto thee?
Or will he speak soft words unto thee?
4 Will he make a covenant with thee,
That thou shouldest take him for a servant for ever?
5 Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?
Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?
6 Shall the bands *of fishermen* make traffic of him?
Shall they part him among the merchants?

---

hunt the hippopotamus and harpoon it, but this is no reason for refusing to identify behemoth with it. The LXX omits the verse, and it is not unlike xli. 2, still we need not omit it.

Duhm places xli. 9–12 after this verse as the conclusion of the section on behemoth. See note on xli. 9.

xli. **1.** The division of chapters is much better in the English than in the Hebrew Bible, in which ch. xli. 1 coincides with xli. 9 of the English.

The author regards the crocodile as defying capture, though, as a matter of fact, the Egyptians were able to take it. The whole description is dominated by this thought. The meaning of the second line is not clear. The crocodile was mistakenly thought by many ancient writers to have no tongue, but the line hardly means 'you cannot press down his tongue, for he has none,' but rather you cannot press down his tongue, for he is too formidable to be attacked. The pressing down of the tongue is taken by many to refer to the pressure on it by the rope to which the hook was attached. But more probably the line refers to a second stage, when you have caught him, can you put a rope round his tongue and lower jaw to lead him about.

2. rope: Heb. 'rope of rushes.' For **hook** the marg. 'spike' would be better. He cannot be treated as others are, but the reference here again is not clear, whether to the custom of stringing fish on a cord to keep them fresh in the water or take them to market, or whether to the leading of wild animals about with rope and hook.

6. Will the guilds of fishermen chaffer over him with the merchants?

Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons, 7
Or his head with fish spears?
Lay thine hand upon him; 8
Remember the battle, and do so no more.
Behold, the hope of him is in vain: 9
Shall not one be cast down even at the sight of him?
None is so fierce that he dare stir him up: 10
Who then is he that can stand before me?
Who hath first given unto me, that I should repay him? 11
Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine.

---

7. Harpoons were used by the ancients, and sometimes had a reel attached to them. The armour of the crocodile seems to the author impregnable to such attacks. Harpoons would glance harmlessly off its scales.

8. Dare to lay your hand on him, you will not have the chance of doing it a second time, so remember beforehand the fatal issue a battle with him would involve.

9. Merx, Bickell, and Cheyne place verses 9–12 before xxxviii. 1, correcting the text considerably and turning it into a soliloquy of God, on which the address to Job follows. The verses do not seem quite at home in their present position. If they are to be removed, however, they would form a very suitable conclusion to the description of behemoth, placed in that case, as by Duhm, after xl. 24. At present that description breaks off rather abruptly. Duhm alters the text so that there is no reference to the greatness of God, while verse 12 gets a wholly different sense. Ley agrees with reference to verses 9–11, but leaves the verses in their present connexion.

hope of him: i. e. the hope such a one who attacked the monster might have of subduing him. If the verses are in their true connexion, it would be simpler to read 'thy hope' and 'shalt not thou,' or better 'thou shalt be.'

10. Some MSS. and the marg. read 'him' for **me**, 'And who can stand before him?'

11. The verse in its present form is very loosely attached to the context. With a trifling alteration the LXX, followed by several scholars, reads 'Who has assailed me and been safe?' which gives a fair sense, but does not suit the second line very well, though Duhm's emendation, 'Under the whole heaven not one,' would suit the LXX reading as well as his version of the first line, 'Who has assailed him and been safe?'

12 I will not keep silence concerning his limbs,
Nor his mighty strength, nor his comely proportion.
13 Who can strip off his outer garment?
Who shall come within his double bridle?
14 Who can open the doors of his face?
Round about his teeth is terror.
15 *His* strong scales are *his* pride,
Shut up together *as with* a close seal.
16 One is so near to another,
That no air can come between them.
17 They are joined one to another;
They stick together, that they cannot be sundered.
18 His neesings flash forth light,
And his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning.

---

12. The text is suspicious on account of its unsuitability in a speech of God, and the doubt is confirmed by the fact that the word translated **comely** occurs nowhere else. Duhm with very slight change reads 'He would not renew his boastings, and the talk of valiant deeds and his rich outfit.' The hippopotamus would stop the hunter's swaggering stories of his exploits. The word translated 'parts' might just as well mean 'boastings,' and 'the talk of' is expressed in the Hebrew, but omitted in English. Budde leaves part of the text untranslated.

13. Literally 'Who can uncover the face of his garment,' the face being the inner surface of the scales, next to the flesh.

double bridle is taken to mean his jaws, but the LXX reads his double breastplate (*siryōnō* for *risnō*).

14. doors of his face: i. e. his mouth. The margin for the second line 'His teeth are terrible round about' (so A. V.) is not so good as the text.

15. strong scales: marg. 'courses of scales,' Heb. 'channels of shields.' For **pride** we should, following several versions, read 'back.' 'Channels of shields form his back.' The reference is to the rows of shield-shaped scales.

18. neesings: i. e. sneezings. The spray breathed through his nostrils flashes in the sunlight.

eyelids of the morning: cf. iii. 9. The eyes of the crocodile are visible some distance under water. The Egyptians expressed the dawn in the hieroglyphs by the crocodile's eyes.

Out of his mouth go burning torches, 19
And sparks of fire leap forth.
Out of his nostrils a smoke goeth, 20
As of a seething pot and *burning* rushes.
His breath kindleth coals, 21
And a flame goeth forth from his mouth.
In his neck abideth strength, 22
And terror danceth before him.
The flakes of his flesh are joined together: 23
They are firm upon him; they cannot be moved.
His heart is as firm as a stone; 24
Yea, firm as the nether millstone.
When he raiseth himself up, the mighty are afraid: 25
By reason of consternation they are beside themselves.
If one lay at him with the sword, it cannot avail; 26
Nor the spear, the dart, nor the pointed shaft.
He counteth iron as straw, 27
And brass as rotten wood.
The arrow cannot make him flee: 28

19-21. A very hyperbolical description of the monster's steaming breath. But the author may have embroidered his picture with reminiscences of stories of fire-breathing dragons.

22. Terror goes with him wherever he goes.

23, 24. The triple repetition of **firm** is probably due to a textual error.

The underparts, unlike those of other animals, do not hang down flabbily, but are firm and tightly joined together. The lower millstone was proverbially hard, since it had to bear all the grinding pressure of its 'rider.'

25. By reason of consternation. The A. V. translated 'By reason of breakings.' The text is by many supposed to be at fault. Budde reads 'the breakers of the sea,' Duhm 'the watchers,' Giesebrecht 'at his teeth the mighty are beside themselves.'

26. pointed shaft, marg. 'coat of mail,' is unsuitable to the context.

28. arrow: *lit.* 'son of the bow.'

Slingstones are turned with him into stubble.
29 Clubs are counted as stubble:
He laugheth at the rushing of the javelin.
30 His underparts are *like* sharp potsherds:
He spreadeth *as it were* a threshing wain upon the mire.
31 He maketh the deep to boil like a pot:
He maketh the sea like ointment.
32 He maketh a path to shine after him;
One would think the deep to be hoary.
33 Upon earth there is not his like,
That is made without fear.
34 He beholdeth every thing that is high:

---

30. The scales on the underpart of the body are compared to sharp potsherds, so that as he moves across the mire he makes a mark as if a threshing sledge, studded on the under side with teeth, had passed over it. Duhm objects to this that the scales on the underpart are smooth. Dillmann says they are smaller than those on the back, but equally sharp. Davidson says that though smoother than those on the back, they are still sharp. If modern commentators can differ like this on a plain matter of fact, one cannot expect too great precision in a poet, who may have known the crocodile only from reports or reading. Besides, Duhm's emendations are too radical.

31. He churns the sea into froth, the mad turmoil and scum on the surface being suggested by the boiling pot, while the foam, and, as some think, the musky odour, are compared to that made by the perfumer as he whips together the ingredients of an ointment.

32. Several scholars alter the verse in one way or another, but while trifling changes may be desirable, the general sense ought to remain unaffected. As he rushes through the sea, the course he has taken is shown by the shining furrow behind him, and the white foam that spreads over the surface gives the sea a hoary appearance.

33. his like: some prefer to translate 'his ruler,' but the text is better.

34. The first line gives a poor sense, far better with most recent scholars 'Everything that is high feareth him,' which gives

He is king over all the sons of pride.

[M] Then Job answered the LORD, and said, **42**
[A] I know that thou canst do all things, 2
And that no purpose of thine can be restrained.
Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge? 3
Therefore have I uttered that which I understood not,
Things too wonderful for me, which I knew not.
[M] Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak; 4
I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.
[A] I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; 5

---

a better parallel to the next line, and an excellent contrast to 'without fear.'

sons of pride: i. e. the proud beasts of prey, see xxviii. 8.

xlii. The beginning of Job's speech has been misplaced, and is now found in xl. 3–5.

3. The first line is quoted from xxxviii. 2. That Job should drop into soliloquy and repeat Yahweh's words may seem to some a subtle beauty, the present writer can see in it nothing but an artificiality. Rather we must regard this line and the similar quotation in verse 4[b] as originally written on the margin by a reader, as very appropriate reminders of what God had said, unless with Klostermann we can save this line by reading ''Tis I that hide counsel without knowledge' (*'ănī* for *mī*). The suggestion that the words are here spoken by Yahweh, twice breaking in on Job's speech, seems to the present writer quite unacceptable, especially in the case of 3[a]. Job's penitent confession would have met with a very ungracious and inappropriate response.

4. Not a request by Job for fuller teaching, for God has spoken and Job acquiesces in his ignorance. The second line is a quotation from xxxviii. 3, written on the margin (see note on verse 3), and out of it, by the addition of a parallel line, a couplet has been made. The whole verse is an insertion.

5. The supreme lesson of the book. His previous knowledge of God was that given by the traditional theology, in which he had been trained. It left no room for the suffering of the righteous; if the righteous suffered, then the theology was false. Such an inference Job had felt forced to draw. But now he has seen God, and all is changed. He knows that God is righteous, he knows that, though he suffers, he is righteous also. How these apparent contradictories can be intellectually reconciled he

But now mine eye seeth thee,
6 Wherefore I abhor *myself*, and repent
In dust and ashes.

7 And it was so, that after the LORD had spoken these words unto Job, the LORD said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two

---

does not know. But he and God are again at one, a deeper fellowship is possible, untroubled by misgivings as to God's moral integrity. Happy, even in his pain, that he has found himself and his God, he would rather suffer, if God willed it, than be in health and prosperity. He knows that all is well, he and his sufferings have their place in God's inscrutable design; why should he seek to understand it? in childlike reverence he acknowledges it to be far beyond him. This mystical solution is the most precious thing the book has to offer us. On the meaning of this and of the speeches of Yahweh see further in the Introduction.

6. abhor *myself*: marg. is probably better, 'loathe *my words*.' The verb has no object in Hebrew.

xlii. 7–9. When Yahweh had spoken to Job, He censures the friends for not speaking right of Him as Job had done. They are bidden sacrifice, and on Job's intercession are spared the punishment they had deserved.

xlii. 10–17. Job is restored to prosperity, and his possessions are doubled. His relatives and friends visit him and make him presents. He has seven sons and three daughters, the fairest women in the land, and inheriting with their brothers. He dies in a good old age, seeing his descendants to the fourth generation.

7. The view that the prose portions of the book were borrowed from an older saga finds here one of its strongest supports. Yahweh's harsh judgement seems to correspond ill with the pious tone in which the friends speak. They had sincerely wished to uphold the honour of God, and that they had made mistakes was a pardonable offence. Moreover Job, so far from winning the approval of Yahweh in the speech out of the storm, was declared by Him to have darkened counsel by words without knowledge. We could understand the verse much better, if originally the friends had been represented as speaking in the tone of Job's wife, and Job himself as speaking in the tone of i. 21, ii. 10. But while the expressions are not well suited to the debate as we now have it, the poet did not scruple to retain them, and even to put

friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is
right, as my servant Job hath. Now therefore, take unto 8
you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant
Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my
servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept, that
I deal not with you after your folly; for ye have not spoken
of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath.
So Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and 9
Zophar the Naamathite went, and did according as the
LORD commanded them: and the LORD accepted Job.
And the LORD turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed 10
for his friends: and the LORD gave Job twice as much
as he had before. Then came there unto him all his 11
brethren, and all his sisters, and all they that had been
of his acquaintance before, and did eat bread with him in
his house: and they bemoaned him, and comforted him
concerning all the evil that the LORD had brought upon

---

a prediction of them in Job's mouth (xiii. 7–11). For their general sense, that Job was more in harmony with the truth of things than the servile special pleaders for God, was his own verdict, though he would not have spoken of either quite in this way. And he has been justified by the interpretation placed on the words by his commentators. He was in a measure fettered by the tradition.

3. A large atoning offering, supplemented by Job's prayers, presupposes a great transgression. The burnt-offering as in i. 5. It is noteworthy that while the story represents Job as successfully interceding for the friends, Ezekiel says that Noah, Daniel, [? Enoch], and Job could deliver themselves only by their righteousness. It is also remarkable that Eliphaz had unconsciously predicted this in xxii. 30.

10. turned the captivity: better 'reversed the fortune.' The expression might conceivably be chosen with reference to Israel's fortunes, but in any case Job and Israel are not to be identified.

twice as much: cf. Isa. lxi. 7; Zech. ix. 12.

11. piece of money: Heb. 'kesitah,' Gen. xxxiii. 19; Joshua xxiv. 32. The narrator is faithful to the conditions of the patriarchal age. The money was apparently uncoined. The presents

him: every man also gave him a piece of money, and
12 every one a ring of gold. So the LORD blessed the latter
end of Job more than his beginning: and he had fourteen
thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand
13 yoke of oxen, and a thousand she-asses. He had also
14 seven sons and three daughters. And he called the name
of the first, Jemimah; and the name of the second,
Keziah; and the name of the third, Keren-happuch.
15 And in all the land were no women found so fair as the
daughters of Job: and their father gave them inheritance
16 among their brethren. And after this Job lived an

---

were simply tokens of congratulation, not designed to enrich him, their value was too trifling.

13. While his possessions are doubled, it is a fine trait that the number of the children is the same as before. For us no child lost can be replaced, the feeling of antiquity differed to some extent from ours. It would be a mistake to suppose that the narrator meant that in the next life the children he had lost would be restored to him, and thus the children would be doubled to him then as his possessions were now. Such a hope was unknown to him.

14. Jemimah: perhaps 'dove.' **Keziah** is cassia. **Keren-happuch** is generally taken to mean 'horn' (or 'box') 'of eye-paint.' This was used to make the eye look brighter (2 Kings ix. 30; Jer. iv. 30). Cheyne formerly explained 'one who sets off the company in which she is, as antimony does the eye' ('Jeremiah' in *Pulpit Commentary*, p. 82). Now he thinks the name very improbable, and suggests 'scent of apples,' a much prettier name, to our taste at any rate. For Jemimah he reads Temimah 'spotless.'

15. The Jewish law allowed daughters to inherit when there was no son (Num. xxvii. 1-11). Job gives his daughters an inheritance with the sons, so that the family may remain united, as the former family is represented to have been, i. 4. That, so fair and so rich, they married goes without saying.

16. hundred and forty: twice seventy, it is not unlikely that the story represented Job as receiving after his trial double the number of years as before it, if so he was seventy when his trial overtook him. The LXX reads a hundred and seventy instead of a hundred and forty, and makes the total length of his life two hundred and forty years. That makes him seventy at the time of his trial.

hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons' sons, *even* four generations. So Job died, being old and 17
full of days.

---

17. The LXX adds 'and it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raises up.' After this follows a series of statements on Job's genealogy and related matters; they are taken from some Aramaic writing and have no value of any kind. The reference to the resurrection is interesting, partly as an indication that at the time when it was added a resurrection of the eminently righteous was expected, but still more as an evidence for the early interpretation of xix. 25–27 as a reference to the resurrection.

INDEX

Abaddon, 235, 252, 268.
Addis, 47.
Ahab, 31, 59, 274.
Alcyone, 113.
Alexander Jannaeus, 41.
Ali Baba, 228.
Allen, Grant, 270.
Amos, 93.
Angelology, 39, 81 f., 286.
Angels, 79, 81–84, 156, 233, 283–286, 315.
— Destroying, 8, 284.
— Intercessory, 8, 83, 87, 284 f.
Animal creation, 17.
Animals, Knowledge possessed by, 134, 249, 296.
Apocalyptic, 224.
Arabian Nights, 196.
Arabic, 40, 117.
Aramaeans, 54.
Aramaisms, 24, 40.
Arcturus, 307.
Arnold, Matthew, 247.
Aurora, 7, 311, 321.
Avicenna, 103.

Babylon, 159.
Baethgen, 47.
Balaam, Elihu identified with, 22.
Ban, 159.
Barbarians, 100.
Barth, 121.
Bear, 321.
Beer, 48, 72, 85, 87, 95, 101, 109, 112, 114, 120–123, 126, 134, 145, 150, 157, 160, 164, 169, 171, 174, 182 f., 325.
Behemoth, 30, 329–331, 335–339.
Bennett, 115.
Bernard, 47.
Bickell, 35 f., 47, 70, 85, 94, 97, 99, 101, 112, 120, 127, 129, 145, 164, 173, 193, 198, 215, 223, 226 f., 229, 245, 248, 251, 257, 277, 280–283, 291, 309–312, 316, 319, 323, 325, 329, 337, 339.
Bildad, 10, 15, 33, 44 f., 54, 68, 106 f., 110, 117, 125, 130, 152, 174, 178–180, 182, 184–186, 197, 203 f., 207, 228, 230–235, 238, 240 f., 288.
Biskra button, 66.
Bless in sense of curse, 57.
Blood, Cry of, 168, 274.
Bradley, 47.
Breath, 81.
Briggs, 21.
Brown F., 54.
Brown J., 64.
Bruce, 47.
Budde, 21, 23 f., 26, 47, 49, 58, 61, 65, 71 f., 74, 84–86, 89, 93, 101, 105, 120, 129, 134, 136 f., 139, 142, 145, 149 f., 155, 158, 160, 164, 169, 171 f., 174–176, 182–184, 188, 192, 199–201, 203, 207 f., 214–217, 220–223, 225, 227, 229, 245, 248, 251 f., 254 f., 257, 263, 274, 277, 280, 282, 288, 290–292, 294 f., 299, 301 f., 304 f., 307–309, 323, 327, 329 f., 335, 337, 340 f.
Burney, 320.
Burnt offering, 57, 345.
Buz, 54, 276.
Byron, 266.

Cain, 274.
Calebites, 54.
Canis Major, 114, 320.
Caravan, 10, 42, 46, 96 f.
Carlyle, 292, 327.
Cerberus, 317.
Chaldeans, 54, 63.
Chaos, 6, 72, 236, 315.
Chaplin, 66 f.
Character drawing, 45.
Cheyne, 28, 47 f., 63, 69-72, 74, 78, 84, 86, 101, 104, 129, 137, 142, 145 f., 162, 169, 317, 321, 335, 339, 346.
Chronicles, 39.
Civilization, 45, 225, 260, 324.
Clouds, 5-7, 42 f., 236 f., 304 f., 308-311, 315, 321 f.
Colossians, 83.
Conjectural emendation, 37.
Constellations, 7, 44, 46.
Coptic translation of LXX, 35.
Cornill, 21, 25-27, 330.
Corrections of the scribes, 105.
Couplets, 35 f., 41.
Cox, 47.
Crocodile, 335, 338-343.
Curse, 70, 84, 228.

Damascus, 147.
Daniel, 345.
Darkness, 6 f., 43 f., 129 f., 236, 316-318.
Date of poem, 37-41.
Davidson, A. B., 47 f., 58, 72, 85, 113, 135, 142, 156, 166, 174, 236, 327, 342.
Davison, 47 f.
Dawn, 43, 72 f., 316, 340.
Day, 69, 71.
Daysman, 119.
Death, 147 f., 150 f., 252.
Dedan, 276.
Deep, The, 6, 43, 236, 251, 317.
Delitzsch, 47, 161.
Delitzsch, Fried., 47, 54, 57, 74, 86, 96, 114, 119, 127.
Deluge, 317.
Desert, 45 f., 62 f., 319, 324.
Dew, 319.
Dido, 177.
Dillmann, 35, 37 f., 47, 49, 58, 65, 82, 93, 101, 105, 108 f., 121, 135, 137, 142, 145 f., 154, 156, 160, 164, 172, 174-176, 196, 203, 216, 240, 251, 262, 265, 283, 320, 325, 327, 342.
Dillon, 36, 47.
Dislocation of speeches, 10 f., 33 f.
Dragon, 72.
Driver, 36, 48.
Duhm, 47-49, 57, 64, 66, 70, 72-74, 76, 79, 81, 83, 85-87, 90, 93-97, 99, 101, 104, 108-110, 112, 114-116, 118-123, 127-129, 133-138, 141 f., 145 f., 153-156, 158-160, 163-166, 169, 172-175, 177-179, 182 f., 186 f., 191, 194-203, 207 f., 215-217, 221-227, 229, 231, 234-236, 241, 243, 245 f., 248-250, 257, 259 f., 263-266, 269-272, 277, 280-284, 288-292, 294, 296, 299 f., 302, 304 f., 307-311, 318 f., 321-323, 325, 329, 337-342.

Eagle, 86, 322, 328 f.
Earthquake, 113.
East, Children of the, 54.
Ecclesiastes, 40, 46, 314.
Eclipse, 6 f., 72, 113.
Ecthyma, 66, 266.
Edom, 54.
Effigy of the dead, 210.
Egypt, 46, 108, 115, 247.
Elephantiasis, 66, 167, 171, 181, 190.
Elihu, 3, 7 f., 21-30, 54, 83, 89, 152, 274-283, 286 f., 289-291, 293-295, 297 f., 303 f., 306, 309-314.
Elijah, 81, 314.

Eliphaz, 10–12, 44, 54, 68, 75, 77–81, 83 f., 86 f., 89, 91 f., 98, 101, 106–108, 112, 125, 129, 152–156, 161–163, 170, 197 f., 203 f., 207, 212 f., 216, 218, 232, 234 f., 240, 286, 295, 298, 345.
Elohim, Sons of. *See* Sons of God.
Elymas, 88.
Elzas, 47, 79, 101.
Encyclopaedia Biblica, 48, 145, 169, 320 f., 335.
Enoch, 83, 308, 318, 345.
Epilogue, 22, 29–33, 91, 344.
Euphemism, 57.
Euphrates, 54.
Ewald, 47, 65, 74, 81, 135, 146, 158 f., 170, 181, 216.
Exile, 37 f.
Ezekiel, 32, 90.
Ezra, 40.

Fairbairn, 47.
Fellowship with God, 9, 13, 16, 46, 148 f.
— impossible in Sheol, 9.
Firmament, 7, 236, 310.
First-born of death, 181.
Flame, Sons of, 86 f.
Flood story, 215.
Folly, 32 f., 67.
Foreign influence, 157.
Friends of Job, 3, 9–16, 22–27, 32 f., 45, 68 f., 76 f., 96–99, 136, 139–141, 151, 172, 190, 211, 239, 344 f.
Frost, 44, 319.
Froude, 47.

Gehenna, 283.
Geiger, 148, 275.
Genung, 21, 47.
Gesenius, 58, 63, 196.
Giants, 235, 320.
Gibson, 47.
Giesebrecht, 47, 336, 341.
Gilbert, 47.
Godet, 47.
Granaries, 7, 307.
Green, 47.
Grill, 223.
Gunkel, 72, 237, 335.

Hail, 7, 318.
Halévy, 193.
Hastings, 48, 66, 79.
Hatch, 35, 251, 277, 325.
Havilah, 63.
Hawk, 322, 328 f.
Heaven, Heights of, 128.
— Pillars of, 6 f., 237.
— Vault of, 6, 237, 318.
Heavenly bodies, Worship of, 5.
Herodotus, 256.
Herzog, 48.
Hezron, 276.
Hippopotamus, 335-338.
Hirzel, 161.
Hitzig, 47, 135, 160, 177, 225.
Hoffmann, 47, 86, 90, 171, 223, 260, 276, 318.
Holiness, Contagious, 57.
Holtzmann, Oscar, 40.
Holy Ones, 83.
Hommel, 63.
Hoonacker, 28 f., 273.
Horse, 43, 327 f.
Hyades, 320.

Idolatry, 5, 38 f.
Idumaea, 247.
Immortality, 20, 27, 102, 147 f., 192.
Imprecation, Formula of, 61.
Iniquity, 127.
Inscription, 191.
Irony, 26, 44 f., 60, 102, 314.
Isaiah, 214.
Ishmael, 129.
Israel, 38 f.

Jackal, 266, 326.
Jacob, 108.

James, W., 332.
Jehoiachin, 37.
Jemimah, 346.
Jerahmeel, 54, 276.
Jeremiah, 37, 60.
Jericho, 159.
Jerusalem, Destruction of, 37.
Jesus, 147, 323.
Job, 3 f., 9, and *passim*.
— Name of, 54 f.
— Disease of, 3, 31, 66 f., 100 f., 171, 190.
Job's wife, 9, 31 f., 63, 67, 188 f., 344.
Jordan, 337.
Judas, 61.

Kamphausen, 21, 47, 93, 226.
Kassim, 63.
Kautzsch, 81, 192.
Kennicott, 239.
Keren-happuch, 346.
Keziah, 346.
Kingu, 335.
Kipling, 290.
Klostermann, 48, 93, 95, 116, 132 f., 182, 193, 196, 200, 202, 210, 230, 257, 260, 291, 314, 343.
Kuenen, 49, 58, 132, 223, 231 f., 240.

Lagarde, 118, 171.
Lebanon, 247.
Leviathan, 6, 30, 72, 237, 329–331.
Ley, 47, 72, 94, 133, 150, 156, 159 f., 173, 175, 181, 185, 194, 196 f., 208, 217, 220, 228 f., 232, 241, 248, 264–266, 268, 273 f., 282, 293 f., 299, 302, 336 f., 339.
Light, 6 f., 43, 236, 304 f.
Lightning, 7, 44, 62, 304 f., 308, 318.
Lilith, 90, 159, 183.
Lion, 42, 79, 322.
Locust, 43, 328.
Longfellow, 87.
Lotus, 337.
Lucretius, 74, 102.
Lye, 118.
Lying spirit, 31, 59.

Macalister, 66 f.
Malachi, 40.
Mallock, 74, 102.
Man, 8, 13, 17, 79.
— First, 7, 154.
Manu, 154.
Marduk, 5.
Margoliouth, 48.
Marshall, 30, 47, 49, 101, 109, 179, 181 f., 197, 201, 208, 217, 227–229, 232, 236, 240, 248, 283, 290 f., 293–295, 305, 316, 320, 332.
Marti, 71.
Masterman, 67.
Mazzaroth, 320.
Merx, 21, 47, 79, 146, 174, 201, 216, 223, 225, 227, 245, 285, 316, 320 f., 339.
Metaphors, 41–43.
Meteor, 321.
Metre, 36.
Micaiah, 59.
Mining, 247–251.
Mirror, 310.
Moloch, 173.
Moon, 5, 71, 234, 236.
Morning stars, 8, 315.
Moses, 37.
Moulton, 208.
Mountains, 6, 236 f.
Mourning women, 171.
Müller, W. M., 335.

Naamah, 68.
Naaman, 285.
Naboth, 274.
Naharina, 54.
Nahor, 54.
Nature and Man, 90 f.
Nebuchadnezzar, 159, 185.

Nephilim, 59, 215.
Nero, 143.
Night, 70, 316–318.
Nile, 337.
Nile grass, 41, 108.
Noah, 345.
Nöldeke, 68, 71.

Ocean, The heavenly, 6, 304 f., 317 f.
Olive, 161.
Olshausen, 305.
Ophir, 217.
Oriental sore, 66 f.
Origen, 35.
Orion, 6, 113, 320.
Ostrich, 266, 325–327.
Outcasts, 46, 225, 258–261.
Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, 188.

Papyrus, 108.
— boats, 118.
Parallelism, 37, 41.
Pathos, 45.
Paul, 83, 90 f., 100, 296.
Peake, 48, 115.
Pharaoh, 112.
Philo, 146.
Phoenix, 41, 256.
Pillars of heaven. *See* Heaven.
Plain, Cities of the, 159, 183, 216.
Plato, 40.
Pleiades, 113, 320.
Post, 117.
Post, G. E., 79.
Powers of the desert, 62.
Preiss, 231, 234.
Pride, 25, 60.
Priestly document, 40, 57.
Priests, 137.
Problem of the Book, 9–21.
Prologue, 19, 22, 25 f., 28–33, 107, 110.
Purslain, 93.
Pyramids, 74.

Quatrains, 35 f.
Qur'an, 170.

Rabble, 261 f.
Racial antagonism, 157.
Rahab, 6, 115, 237.
Rain, 6, 43 f., 257, 304, 322.
Rainbow, 318.
Ram, 54.
Raven, 322.
Redeemer. *See* Vindicator.
Reed, 118.
Reiske, 109.
Renan, 47, 330.
Rephaim, 235, 292.
Resurrection, 192, 194 f., 347.
Reuss, 47.
Rosenmüller, 47.
Rotherham, 47.

Sabeans, 62.
Sacrifice, 56 f., 62.
Sanctification, Ritual, 56 f.
Satan, the, 3, 8, 19, 22, 26, 30–32, 39, 53, 59–68, 76, 102.
Satyr, 159.
Schlottmann, 86.
Schmidt, 72.
Schrader, 335.
Schultens, 47.
Scythians, 100.
Sea, 6, 43, 46, 72, 102 f., 113, 128, 237, 315, 317.
Sea-monster, 103, 235.
Second Isaiah, 5, 38 f., 127.
Seir, 54.
Septuagint, 34–36, and *passim*.
Serpent, 6, 72, 237, 249.
Servant of Yahweh, 38 f., 68, 143, 167, 190.
Shades, 8 f., 235.
Shadow of death, 71.
Shaw, 101.
Sheba, 97.
Shebna, 214.
Sheol, 5 f., 8 f., 13 f., 16, 22, 41–44, 73–75, 95, 101 f., 124,

128, 130–132, 148 f., 151, 169, 171, 176 f., 183 f., 192–194, 206, 208, 211, 230, 233, 235, 283, 299, 317, 334.
Siegfried, 40, 79, 83, 87, 89, 95, 110, 126, 129, 134, 158, 160, 165, 169, 171, 173, 175, 179, 181–183, 193 f., 202, 206 f., 214, 216 f., 221, 223, 265, 304.
Sinaitic peninsula, 247.
Sin offering, 57.
Sirius, 113.
Sirocco, 309.
Skin for skin, 65 f.
Sky, 6 f.
Smend, 150.
Smith, 48.
Snow, 7, 118.
Sodom, 37.
Solomon, 37, 134.
Sons of God, 7 f., 43, 58 f., 315.
Sorcerers, 72.
Sparks, 86.
Speech of Yahweh, 4, 16–21, 28–30, 32, 312–314, 329–331.
Spirit, 81.
Stars, 7 f., 43, 86, 113, 156, 215, 233 f., 315.
Stern, 113.
Stork, 326.
Story, not historical, 4.
— not invented, 4.
— of foreign origin, 4.
Studer, 28.
Sûḥu, 54.
Suicide, 103.
Sun, 5, 7, 270.
Swift, 69.
Symbols, Explanation of, 49.

Talisman, The, 319.
Talmud, 22.
Targum, 86.
Tema, 97, 276.
Teman, 68.
Testament of Job, 22, 31.
Text, 34–37.
Theodotion, 35.
Theophany, 305, 308 f., 313 f.,
Thomson, 75 f., 85, 96, 161, 287, 309.
Threshold, Sanctity of the, 227.
Throne of God, 236, 311.
Thunder, 7, 237, 304.
— cloud, 7, 304.
Tiamat, 5, 72, 103, 115, 233, 237, 335.
Trance, 80.
Treasure-hunting, 75 f.,
Triplets, 35 f., 41.
Troglodytes. *See* Outcasts.
Trumbull, 227.

Uncleanness, 146, 155 f., 179, 234.
Universe, God and the, 5–9.
Uz, 4, 53 f., 276.

Vicarious suffering, 38 f.
Victoria Institute, Transactions of the, 66 f.
Vindicator, 168–170, 172, 177, 192, 195, 211.
Vision, 80.
— of God, 18, 20, 25, 192, 195, 246.
Voigt, 183, 307.

Water-flood, 318.
Watson, R. A., 47.
Watson, William, 290.
Wellhausen, 71, 87, 240.
Wetzstein, 161, 227.
Whirlwind, 307.
White of an egg, 93.
Wild ass, 225, 260, 323 f.
— goats, 323.
— ox, 324.
Wilson, Erasmus, 66.
Winckler, 54.
Wind, 63, 252, 307, 318.
Windows of heaven, 317.

Wisdom, The Divine, 8, 128, 130, 136, 154, 246 f., 249–253.
Wisdom, of the Ancients, 107 f., 136, 156 f.
Woman, Eastern estimate of, 8, 55, 155, 234.
Wright, C. H. H., 47.
Wright, G. H. B., 47, 158, 165, 175, 182, 201, 217, 291 f., 319, 322, 325, 336.
Zechariah, 39.
Zedekiah, 37.
Zöckler, 47.
Zodiac, 320 f.
Zophar, 10 f., 13, 15, 83, 106, 125–130, 197–200, 203, 205, 208, 230–232, 239–243, 245 f., 253, 275.
Zimmern, 335.

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
3 3540 00025 8890